PHILOSOPHY

THE JOURNAL OF THE BRITISH INSTITUTE OF PHILOSOPHY

VOL. XIII. No. 50. APRIL, 1938

MORAL POSITIVISM AND MORAL AESTHETICISM

E. F. CARRITT, M.A.

MR. AYER, in *Language, Truth and Logic* (p. 161), says: "Sentences which simply express moral judgments do not say anything. They are pure expressions of feeling and as such do not come under the category of truth and falsehood. . . . Aesthetic terms are used in exactly the same way as ethical terms."

This, I think, is one instance of a tendency to confuse the facts of moral and aesthetic experience which has been disastrous for both ethics and aesthetics. Its direct parentage is confessedly to be found in Hume, with his famous saying that "Morality is more properly felt than judged of," by which I suppose he means that what we call moral judgments would more properly be described as statements about or expressions of feeling. Butler, when controverting such views in the *Preface* to the Sermons, traces the confusion back to Shaftesbury, with the aphorism that "Beauty and Good (which in the context seems to mean moral goodness) are still the same" (*The Moralists*, Pt. III, § ii, 67). Butler says: "The not taking into consideration the authority [i.e. obligation] which is implied in the idea of reflex approbation or disapprobation seems a material deficiency in Lord Shaftesbury's *Inquiry Concerning Virtue* (Bk. I, Pt. III, § iii; *Characteristics*, ii, p. 69). . . . Take in then that authority and obligation which is a constituent part of this reflex approbation, and it will undeniably follow, though a man should doubt of everything else, yet, that he would still remain under the nearest and most certain obligation to the practice of virtue." I want first to consider the view, surely a paradox in terms, that "moral judgments or the sentences expressing

them do not say anything." For those who hold this cannot be expected to listen patiently to a discussion whether moral judgments say something (as Hume thought) about feelings or about some other facts, and if the latter whether they are ever true. If it can be shown that this view of Mr. Ayer is groundless and that moral judgments do assert something, it would be possible to go on to argue next that what they assert is not a state of mind of their maker or of anybody else, and lastly that they can be true. Indeed, if Mr. Ayer's view that "moral judgments assert nothing" can be refuted, we should have already converted at least him to the view that they assert something other than the existence of feelings. For he tells us that he was at first attracted by the view that moral judgments are really statements about somebody's state of feeling, and only when he saw this view to be clearly untenable, resorted to his own paradox as the sole remaining escape from what he calls "an absolutist view of ethics which would undermine the whole of his main argument" (*ibid.*, pp. 156–7). And if it can be shown not only that moral judgments assert something, but that what they assert is (as Mr. Ayer agrees) no state of anybody's mind, but rather a fact independent of anybody's thought or feeling about it, we might finally maintain that there is no reason to doubt that such assertions are sometimes true. Aesthetic judgments, assertions, i.e. that things are beautiful, also, I think, generally *mean* to attribute to the thing a quality independent of anybody's thoughts or feelings. But so far as they do assert this, there are reasons for thinking that perhaps none of them are true in the sense in which they are thus meant. But whether these reasons for denying the truth of aesthetic judgments, except as statements of feeling, are sound or no, they do not apply to moral judgments. Mr. Ayer at least would not pretend to show that moral judgments are false. It was just because his general theory would not allow him to hold any opinion about their truth or falsehood as regards independent facts that he was attracted by the view that they only asserted a state of mind, and when he found that untenable was driven to assert that they assert nothing. The steps of my argument then should be to show:

(1) That moral judgments, as the word judgment implies, assert something.
(2) That what they assert is not the existence of a feeling in myself or others, but, as they profess, a fact which is not a feeling.
(3) That once granted moral judgments do assert such a fact, there are no more valid reasons for doubting the possibility of their truth than that of other types of judgment, the motive for doing so being not any consideration of their own nature,

but the desire to support a peculiar view of truth. And, in particular, we should try to show that certain arguments against the truth of any judgment which asserts beauty to belong to things independently of any feelings about them do not apply to moral judgments.

The first point, then, is that moral judgments assert something.

I

Mr. Ayer says (p. 158): "If I say to someone 'you acted wrongly in taking[1] that money' I am not stating anything more than if I had simply said, 'you took that money.' In adding that this action is wrong I am not making any further statement about it. I am simply evincing my moral disapproval of it. It is as if I had said 'you took that money' in a peculiar tone of horror, or written it with some special exclamation marks. The tone or the exclamation marks adds nothing to the literal meaning of the sentence. It merely serves to show that the expression of it is attended by certain feelings in the speaker. If now I generalize my previous statement and say 'Taking money is (in certain circumstances) wrong,' I produce a statement which has no factual meaning, that is, expresses no proposition which can be true or false. It is as if I had written 'Taking money!!' with two notes of exclamation to show, by a suitable convention, that a special sort of moral disapproval is the feeling which is being expressed." But let us take Mr. Ayer's language in this passage seriously. He says that if I say "you acted wrongly in taking that money" instead of saying "you took that money," the only difference (which he will not allow to be a difference of meaning) is that I *evince* moral disapproval, and again, he says that the sentence "stealing money is wrong" *shows* "by a *suitable convention*[2] that a special sort of moral disapproval is the feeling which is being expressed." But the evincing a feeling, or showing to others that I have a feeling, may be a voluntary act. And when I "adopt a suitable convention" for doing so, it certainly is. I clearly may tell or show a man, or evince to a man, that I feel disgust at what he is doing, though in fact I do not feel any, and he may believe me and alter his conduct in consequence. Evidently Mr. Ayer does not really think that to say "you ought not to take this money" is a mere involuntary symptom of disgust, as sweating may be of pain; it is a deliberate attempt to *show* or convince my audience of something by a *suitable verbal expression*, i.e. to *tell* them something, true or false. And what Mr. Ayer really, for all his protests,

[1] He says "stealing." I have substituted "taking" as he is clearly not entitled to a dyslogistic word.

[2] My italics throughout.

has said is that it tells them that I am feeling a certain disapproval or, as he says, that "a special sort of disapproval *is* the feeling that is being expressed." But unfortunately Mr. Ayer clearly recognizes that the two sentences, "I feel a special sort of moral disapproval for stealing" and "Men ought not to steal," cannot be substituted for one another, since he says that Professor Moore has pointed out there is no contradiction in asserting that stealing is wrong and that I do not have any feeling of disapproval against it, or, as I should prefer to put it, it is a perfectly intelligible question whether an act for which I feel moral disapproval is in fact one I ought not to do.

Just because Mr. Ayer had been convinced by Professor Moore on this point, he has to find some other account of what the statement "stealing is wrong" means. And he only sees two alternatives. He must either admit that when we say "taking such money is wrong" we mean (however mistakenly) that a man ought not to take such money, or he must resort to saying that we mean to assert nothing whatever, but are involuntarily symptomizing horror. It is hard to see how he can avoid the first course. For he grants that people do *think* that they have obligations, or, in his own Kantian language, "Moral precepts *present themselves to some people as* categorical commands" (p. 169), and "they have for some people *the force of* inexorable commands," where he cannot be using the word "command" literally, since moral judgments may apply to myself or to a third person or to past time. So when such people say they have a duty they in fact mean (however mistakenly) just what they say; yet Mr. Ayer argues that nevertheless the sentence they pronounce cannot mean what he allows they want it to mean. In the same way he says (p. 20) that a scientific sentence may be a pseudo-proposition (i.e. unmeaning) to one person, but not to another, since on him it may have the effect of making him believe *its* truth (p. 84) or at least assume its truth. But in that case what is "it"? We cannot either assume or believe the truth of a sentence which means nothing. For instance, Mr. Ayer says the sentence "*p* is a law of nature" may give rise to "a belief in a certain orderliness of nature." Yet he apparently holds that such beliefs, like moral beliefs, owing to a mysterious "rule which determines the literal significance of language," are incapable of being significantly expressed or stated to exist. I am at a loss about the nature of this rule or who issued it, or why it is called a rule rather than a fact. It can hardly be of the type "*Ought* in English means much the same as *Sollen* in German" or "*Ought* means the opposite of *ought not*." So I am driven to fear that it was issued by Mr. Ayer, and that it is precisely the type of "rule" whose validity he is claiming to vindicate, such as "*Ought* means nothing," "*Law of*

nature means nothing." If then "there are laws of nature (or obligations)" and "there are no laws of nature (or obligations)" are both unmeaning, they are not contradictory.

We are led to the curious conclusion that there are a large number of beliefs commonly held but incapable of being formulated in any sentence, and, by a strange coincidence, also a large number of sentences commonly supposed to formulate just those beliefs, but really incapable of meaning or asserting anything. It is a cruel law which debars these potential employers and potential employees from mutual accommodation. Again, if such sentences as "There are laws of nature" or "One ought to keep a promise" cannot mean what those who use them mean them to mean, namely, what Mr. Ayer admits they in fact believe, how did he come to know, or convey to us, what these beliefs are? He tells us men believe there are laws of nature and obligations, but "there are laws of nature (and obligations)" is an unmeaning sentence. Perhaps he remembers that he once held these beliefs and that, when he held them, he "evinced" the fact by certain unmeaning sentences which he then thought asserted what he believed. So he now conjectures that those who utter similar unmeaning sentences hold similar beliefs; and he hopes that when he tells us that "some men believe they have obligations," although "they have obligations" means nothing, we, too, shall recognize the meaningless sentence as a symptom of a belief which cannot be expressed.

But, as I said before, though we cannot sweat in order to prove that we are in pain, we can always utter these symptomatic noises and so "by a *suitable* linguistic *convention*" induce others to believe *something*, either, for instance, that we have obligations or that we think we have. Of course, the fact is that when Mr. Ayer says such sentences as "stealing is wrong" have no meaning, he does not mean by his statement what other people would mean by it, or understand him to mean by it. Indeed, he tells us that he means by it that the sentence "stealing is wrong" "cannot be translated into sentences which refer to sense-contents," or, in his other words, "it cannot be indicated how the proposition expressed by the sentence could be empirically verified." So that all he means when he says "stealing is wrong means nothing" is that it does not mean that the obligation has any sensible qualities such as colour, smell, taste, sound, or shape. And this would be true of some sentences which, I suppose, he would admit to express genuine propositions, if only about the speaker's state of mind, such as "I never understood that before" or "unverifiable sentences are meaningless." The view really implies, though Mr. Ayer would not admit it, that what a sentence means to assert is the possibility of obtaining sense-data which might verify or refute "it." But what then is "it"? Not

surely, unmeaning sounds, for they cannot be verified or refuted. "It" must be the belief which the sentence means to assert and which another sentence may assert is verifiable in a certain way. If a belief, and therefore the sentence which expresses it, are about sensible things, then the sense-perception of those things might tend to refute or to verify that belief and sentence. But a belief cannot be that it is itself verifiable, and the same simple sentence cannot both assert what is believed and also how the belief can be verified. Yet surely the belief itself must be capable of being expressed and the sentence which expresses it must have a meaning. If a conjuror says, "There is a mouse in that box, but by the time you open it it will have disappeared without traces," he may be lying, but he is not making unmeaning sounds or even evincing feelings, and some people may believe him. That the sentences usually called moral judgments are not mere ejaculations which would be incapable of truth or of contradiction and are not even merely statements about the speaker's own feelings, is, I think, satisfactorily shown by Hume (*Enquiry*, IX, 1). "When a man denominates another, his *enemy*, his *rival*, his *antagonist*, his *adversary*, he is understood to speak the language of self-love, and to express sentiments, peculiar to himself, and arising from his particular circumstances and situation. But when he bestows on any man the epithets of *vicious* or *odious* or *depraved*, he then speaks another language, and expresses sentiments, in which he expects all his audience are to concur with him. He must here, therefore, depart from his private and particular situation, and must choose a point of view, common to him with others; he must move some universal principle of the human frame, and touch a string to which all mankind have an accord and symphony. If he means, therefore, to express *that this man possesses qualities, whose tendency is pernicious to society*, he has chosen this common point of view, and has touched the principle of humanity, in which every man, in some degree, concurs." Hume plainly thinks that if I say X ought not to have taken that money from Z, I can be contradicted, and that not merely by saying "I doubt if you really feel the disgust which such noises usually express," or even by saying "Hurrah for X," but rather by saying, "In taking that money from Z, X behaved in a beneficent way, and *therefore* in a way universally or generally agreeable to human contemplation." Indeed, the suggestion that so-called moral judgments assert nothing is so palpably false that I wonder Mr. Ayer did not try rather to bring them under his theory as what he calls tautologies. At least one type of moral judgment, "I ought to keep my promise," seems to be of the kind to which he should on his own theory give that name. It is indisputable that men use the expression "I promise," and I do not see how, when they do so,

it could be maintained that they are either lying or deceived. For, of course, to say "you don't intend to keep your promise" is not to say "you don't promise." And other people understand what we mean when we promise and often alter their behaviour in consequence. Yet it is hard to see what a promise is if it is not, as Hume said, "binding oneself to the performance of an action." A man could not without self-contradiction make a promise while explaining that he was under no obligation to keep it. Possibly this is what Kant really *meant* when he said that to will universal promise-breaking involved a contradiction. If he did, we should have to suppose that by his phrase "willing universal promise-breaking is contradictory" (a phrase I have never understood) he meant "denying the obligation to keep a promise which you have made is contradictory." Curiously enough, Hobbes seems to have held this view (*Leviathan*, XIV): "When a man hath abandoned, or granted away his Right, then is he said to be OBLIGED, or BOUND, not to hinder those, to whom such Right is granted, or abandoned, from the benefit of it: and that he *Ought*, and it is his DUTY, not to make voyd that voluntary act of his own: and that such hindrance is INJUSTICE, and INJURY, as being *sine jure*; the Right being before renounced, or transferred. So that *Injury*, or *Injustice*, in the controversies of the world, is somewhat like to that, which in the disputations of Scholers is called *Absurdity*. For as it is there called an Absurdity to contradict what one maintained in the Beginning; so in the world, it is called Injustice and Injury, voluntarily to undo that, which from the Beginning he hath voluntarily done."

II

To come now to my second point. If we agree with Hume that Mr. Ayer is wrong in saying that moral judgments assert nothing, we must agree with Mr. Ayer that Hume is wrong in saying that what they assert is the prevalence among mankind of a certain pleasure or distaste, arising from sympathy, in the contemplation of human dispositions and of the acts in which they issue. Just as I think Hume satisfactorily refutes Mr. Ayer's view, so I think Mr. Ayer satisfactorily refutes this of Hume. Mr. Ayer says:

"We reject the subjectivist view that to call an action right, or a thing good, is to say that it is generally approved of, because it is not self-contradictory to assert [he might have added it is quite natural and usual to assert] that some actions which are generally approved of are not right, or that some things which are generally approved of are not good. And we reject the alternative subjectivist view that a man who asserts that a certain action is right, or that

a certain thing is good, is saying that he himself approves of it, on the ground that a man who confessed that he sometimes approved of what was bad or wrong would not be contradicting himself" (p. 153). In other words, it is as absurd to translate "I ought not to steal" into "Most men (or I) disapprove of stealing" as it would be to translate "There are canals in Mars" into "I (or most men) think there are." Mr. Ayer then satisfactorily refutes Hume. And what is perhaps almost as interesting is that Hume himself is unable consistently and comfortably to maintain this position. His general view, no doubt, is that there is no such fact as obligation, but only general feelings of pleasure or uneasiness in the contemplation of felicific or pernicious dispositions and acts. He equates good and evil with pleasure and pain (*Treatise*, II, iii, 9). He denies that acts are really right or wrong (III, i, 1). "The distinction of moral good and evil is founded in the pleasure or pain which results from the view of any sentiment or character" (III, ii, 8). "It is the nature and indeed the definition of virtue, that it is a *quality of the mind agreeable to or approved by every one who considers or contemplates it*" (*Enquiry*, VIII). The only difference between parricide and the choking by a sapling of its parent tree, lies in the different feelings with which we regard the two (*Treatise*, III, i, 1). Such, I say, is Hume's general view, but he is too candid to stick to it. He continually, however inconsistently, insists that all who do not condemn acts done in the belief that they are pernicious and approve those done in the belief that they are beneficent are not only exceptional, but in fact wrong. Since benevolent acts and dispositions have in fact a tendency to promote felicity, they always *deserve* the approval of human beings, which they obtain from all those who have any "rectitude of disposition" (*Enquiry*, App. I). The rules of justice arise from the aversion to doing a *hardship* to another (as distinct from merely harming him) (*Enquiry*, App. III). A promise is described as a form of words by which "a man binds himself to the performance of any action" and thereby "subjects himself to the penalty of never being trusted again in case of failure." At last, in the *Enquiry* (IX, 2), Hume is constrained to face the question of what is meant by saying we "ought" to be honest if we think it not the best policy. He "confesses that if a man think this much requires an answer it would be a little difficult to find any which will to him appear satisfactory." He discredits the holders of such "pernicious" views by suggesting that their "practice will be answerable to their speculation." "*Ingenuous* natures" have "an antipathy to *treachery* and roguery." "Consciousness of *integrity* . . . will be cultivated by every *honest* man who *feels the importance* of it." Here Hume is trying to defend what he calls our "interested obligation to virtue," and finds he can only

do it by maintaining, against Hobbes, that we all have a disinterested (moral) liking to contemplate acts tending to the welfare of others, just as we have a disinterested (aesthetic) liking to contemplate *things* useful to them. Yet he can only make this a plausible account of obligation by substituting for "liking" "approval," and by insisting that those in whom it does not prevail are not merely abnormal, but base, villainous, depraved, rogues—language which would be silly if applied to a taste for sherbet or Edgar Wallace. To say that honesty will be cultivated by every honest man who feels the importance of it is either to say that if you like being honest you like it, or that you ought to be honest. The whole argument is only one of those, in Hume's own words, "sufficient for discourse, and serving all our purposes in company, in the pulpit, on the theatre, and in the schools" (*Treatise*, III, iii, 3). Arguing against the view that moral distinctions are artificial or arbitrary, he says: "Had nature made no such distinction, founded in the original constitution of the mind, the words *honourable* and *shameful*, *lovely* and *odious*, *noble* and *despicable*, had never had place in any language; nor could politicians, had they invented these terms, ever have been able to render them intelligible, or make them convey any idea to the audience." He should have asked himself whether philosophers would have been more successful had they invented the term obligation.

Holding, as he does, that what we call obligation is merely the liking for those acts whose felicific nature gives us a sympathetic pleasure, he finds strange the fact that " a convenient house and a virtuous character cause not the same feeling of approbation, even though the source of our approbation be the same and flows from sympathy and an idea of their utility. There is something very inexplicable in this variation of our feelings." I suggest the explanation that the sources are in fact, as Hume would say, "pretty different."

Adam Smith, in his *Theory of the Moral Sentiments* (1759), seems to be troubled at this inconsistency by which Hume, while asserting that a moral judgment is merely the statement that men have a feeling of a certain kind, also tries to justify that feeling by asserting that we are stating it to be a feeling aroused by the intended utility of the action, i.e. that we are stating some fact about the action or the agent. Accordingly Smith abandons the reference to utility. "The idea of the utility of all qualities of this kind is plainly an afterthought, and not what first recommends them to our approbation" (I, i, 4). What then is it that so recommends them? He answers: "To approve of the passion of another, as suitable to their objects, is the same thing as to observe that we entirely sympathize with them. . . . His own sentiments are the standards and measures

by which he judges of mine. . . . In the suitableness or unsuitableness, in the proportion or disproportion which the affection *seems* to bear to the cause or object which excites it, consists the propriety or impropriety, the decency or ungracefulness of the consequent action" (I, i, 3). That is to say, an action is *really* improper if it springs from a feeling which *seems* to me improper. This is Hume reduced to consistency. It is clearly intended to put moral approval into the same category with aesthetic approval. For it has been often and not unplausibly held that we approve works of art and scenes of nature when they express a feeling with which we sympathize or with which they succeed in making us sympathize. But no more than Hume can Smith be quite content with such moral subjectivity. To this account of "the decency or ungracefulness of an action" he inconsequently appends a quite different account of its "merits." "In the beneficial or hurtful nature of the effects which the affection aims at, or tends to produce, consists the *merit* or *demerit* of the action, the quality by which it is *entitled* to reward or *deserving* of punishment."

So far, then, I have tried to maintain (1) that judgments about obligation *are* judgments; that is, they assert a fact and can be intelligibly contradicted. This, I think, Hume shows. And (2) that they do not assert anything about our own feelings or those of others, but a fact, namely an obligation, which though it may depend upon somebody having or being capable of some feeling, is not itself a feeling. And this, I think, Mr. Ayer shows.

III

It now remains to ask whether there is reason to think that all judgments thus asserting obligations must be false because on reflection we see that what we took for obligation is in fact a feeling. The answer seems to be that there is no such reason apart from the *dogma* that no judgments are true, or that there is no reason to think them so, unless they either could be sensibly verified or merely "state our intention to use language in a certain way."

The chief *argument* that moral judgments must be untrue is derived from a false analogy drawn between them and aesthetic judgments, which are assumed to be untrue if intended to assert an objective beauty. But just as I think the view that so-called moral judgments are meant to state the feelings of those who make them or of others is false, so I think the view that on reflection we see that consequently they are untrue, and that we must substitute for them judgments which do state the feelings of ourselves or others about actions is also false. And this latter false view, I believe, is closely connected with the venerable failure to distinguish moral

and aesthetic experience. Plato used the epithet καλὸς without misgiving of νόμοι (meaning just and beneficent laws, which we ought to enact), of ψυχαί and ἐπιτηδευματα (meaning just, brave, and temperate conduct and character, not those which are dramatic or arresting), and also of pottery and animal bodies. And he explicitly maintained that beauty, if not identical with moral goodness, is what conduces to it. No doubt he thought both beauty and goodness were real qualities independent of human feelings about them, but his confusion of the two was probably connected in Greek as in modern thought with the accompanying failure to distinguish clearly the fact of obligation from feelings of attraction or repugnance. At the renaissance of moral and aesthetic reflection in this country in the eighteenth century, the identification of beauty either with moral goodness or with moral edification became a commonplace: aestheticians perhaps thinking thereby to recommend their subject to the puritan, and moralists theirs to the world. The arts were often criticized merely by a didactic standard, and obligation was reduced to mere sensibility. Since most people find a certain satisfaction in contemplating a so-called moral action and a so-called virtuous character, it was overlooked both that they also get aesthetic satisfaction in contemplating the very opposite, and also that the very nature of a moral act is to be done from a belief that we are obliged to it. The question is whether that belief can be true.

A moral judgment (e.g. that I ought to pay this money) means something and can be significantly contradicted. But it is not contradicted by denying that I or the majority of people take any pleasure in contemplating the payment. The creditor's claim cannot vary with sympathies, or debts could be cancelled by propaganda. The judgment "he acted morally" no doubt generally *implies* a feeling of approbation, but it *states* that he did what he did because he believed it his duty; and this belief was not about feelings but about obligation.

It is by no means so clear that judgments like "The Alps are beautiful" or "Pope's Odyssey is less beautiful than that of Voss" truly assert any real quality of things other than their relation to human feelings. It is not clear that the Alps always had a quality of beauty though everybody had so far loathed the horrid sight, nor that the second statement could be consistent with asserting that everybody who knew both preferred Pope. And whatever our decision on the point may be, it is a significant fact that what by reflection becomes clearer about the moral judgments becomes less clear about the aesthetic.

It has been long recognized that an object beautiful to the naked eye may seem ugly under the microscope, and that the colours, shadows, sounds, and scents, which play so large a part in aesthetic

experience, must be very different to beings with different organs, and can hardly be said to exist as such when they are not being experienced. More recently we have come to believe that even the configuration and movement of what we call physical bodies are very different from anything that we ever perceive. It may be replied that, though people are mistaken in attributing beauty, as they do, to physical things, yet it can be truthfully attributed to sensible appearances,[1] which may be beautiful though nobody observes it. But there still remains to notice a much more interesting characteristic of beauty, suggested already by the Alps and Homer. The beauty of sights and sounds depends, at least very largely, on their "meaning" for us, and this meaning is different for different persons; in fact, "it is not they but we who mean." So "what I hear" may not only be different from "what you said," but may affect me differently according as I more or less know the language and your personal idiom and according to the associations I myself have with the words used and the things mentioned, or according to my mood. And if I should hear exactly similar sounds twice, but, owing to such differences, think them beautiful once but not again, it is hard to say at which time, if either, I should be wrong.

This is pretty obvious in literature; hardly less so in painting and sculpture, since the artist seldom denies himself all reference to natural objects, which affect us differently according to our sex, colour, climate, training, and religion; and it is not really doubtful about a great part of music and architecture. Sir Donald Tovey, on Beethoven's *Mass in D*, says that in the *Dona Nobis Pacem* "trumpets and drums are heard with martial rhythm." This can hardly help affecting one way or another the beauty which a hearer ascribes to the music; yet it must depend on what he happens to know and feel about warfare. At any rate, different systems of harmony are conventional.

Something of the same sort must be true of much natural beauty, and not that only of human face or form. The reason of the almost universal distaste for mountains in the seventeenth century and the almost universal admiration for them in the nineteenth must have been that men had different associations with them or went to them in a different spirit. Ruskin[2] has described with eloquent candour the change in his aesthetic experience of the same visible scene when he discovered that it was not a mist-wreathed Alp but a glass roof behind blue smoke.

Not only may the same sound or vision be beautiful to a man

[1] Or to "some more complex whole." It is hard to discuss this suggestion till it is made more explicit. It may mean just what I do.

[2] *Mod. Painters*, IV, x, § 8.

and not to another, or to himself in a different mood, but it may also have entirely different beauties, depending upon his mental habit or condition.

> Thou'll break my heart, thou bonny bird,
> That sings upon the bough;
> Thou minds me of the happy days
> When my fause Love was true.

Not only must this have much more beauty to a reader whose own sorrow has been set to bird-song, but the song itself must have had a very different beauty to Burns, or to the girl he speaks for, when love was false and when it was true.

No doubt our attitudes to nature and to works of art, especially to recent ones by known artists, are different. To admire mountains is equally legitimate whether they are thought of as awful solitudes or as happy playgrounds, though the "beauties" so seen must be different. But an artist *meant* to express something, and we have a historical interest in knowing what it was, as well as a well-founded suspicion that so we shall get the best aesthetic experience out of his work. Yet we do not trouble whether the "beauties" we find in a ruined cloister or a primitive ballad were intended, or were found there by their first admirers.

Kant[1] tried to exclude all such elements in beauty, which depend upon some conception or meaning or association, from pure or free beauty, and called them dependent beauty. Pure beauty is exemplified only in arabesques, figures, and inorganic objects whose contemplation pleases us by their mere form, such as ripples and perhaps clouds and flowers abstracted from all the sensuous charm of colour and from any thought of adaptation to purpose or of resemblance to other things. It has been questioned, by the Empathy school and by Croce, whether even such things as these do not get their beauty from our natural or acquired tendency to read into them some significance, some correspondence with our own activities and affections. But, however that may be, Kant, though rejecting any such hypothesis, cannot allow that beauty is an objective quality of external phenomena or their relations. It is merely the pleasant feeling aroused in us by the consciousness of a harmonious free play of our perceptive faculties in apprehending the object: "The judgment of taste is not scientific but aesthetic, by which I mean that it is a judgment for which the ground can only be subjective. . . . All our ideas can refer to objects, except those only which refer to the feelings of pleasure and pain. Here nothing is indicated in the object, but we have a feeling of ourselves as we are affected by the idea" (§ 1).

[1] *K. d. U.*, § 16.

I quote Kant as one who, having tried to eliminate from beauty proper all its more obviously subjective elements, all secondary qualities, and all associations or conceptions of use or resemblance, was naturally averse from any expressionist theory. Yet, though he believed that we claim agreement from all men in our judgments about this pure beauty, he was convinced that "Beauty apart from relation to our feeling is itself nothing" (§ 9).

Even if the simple perception of form apart from any significance were the sufficient stimulus for a genuine aesthetic experience, I should still agree with Richard Price:[1] "It seems impossible to conceive objects themselves to be endowed with more than a particular order of parts, and with powers, or an affinity to our perceptive faculties, thence arising; and if we call this beauty, then it is an absolute, inherent quality of certain objects; and equally existent whether any mind discerns it or not. But, surely, order and regularity are, more properly, the causes of beauty than beauty itself."

It must be allowed, as the Provost of Oriel[2] points out, that we commonly *mean* by "beauty" (as we do by "pleasant" though not by "strange") a quality belonging to an object apart from relation to minds; but I agree with him that, on reflection, we see that the things called beautiful or pleasant may not have any common character (as "surprising" things have not) except the power to produce in some persons a particular kind of experience. "The actual occurrence of the enjoyment depends on conditions in the experient as well as conditions in the object." So if one man calls the object beautiful and another ugly, both are wrong if they are asserting it has either independent quality; both may be right if they only mean that it is capable of exciting genuine aesthetic enjoyment and repulsion in different persons.

This view is not inconsistent with Kant's claim that we *demand*, though we do not find, universal agreement with our aesthetic judgments—if only the object could, as it never can, have precisely the same emotional significance to all men. Nor is it inconsistent with the distinction of good and bad taste. Bad taste is the incapacity or narrowly limited capacity for pure aesthetic experiences. A man who enjoys contemplating nothing which does not soothe or profit or edify him, or gratify his pride or malice or appetites and affections, has bad taste. He may use the word beautiful, but he has few or no aesthetic experiences. The more capacity a man has for pure aesthetic experiences the better his taste, whatever the objects which arouse them.

Similarly a man is more *moral* (as distinct from being naturally

[1] *Review of the Principal Questions in Morals.*

[2] Ross, *The Right and the Good*, p. 128 n.

virtuous on the one hand and correctly behaved on the other) the more moral experiences he has; that is to say, the more acts he does because he believes them to be his duty. The character of what he does in no way affects his morality. There are no acts moral or immoral in themselves apart from the agent's beliefs about his obligations. It is perhaps this analogy between morality and good taste which has contributed to the confusion of moral and aesthetic judgments. But the vital difference for which I have been contending remains. Moral judgments are of two kinds: "That act was done because the agent thought it his duty," and "A given situation involves an obligation on rational beings to act in a certain way." Both types of judgment seem to be true or false whatever people may think or feel about the acts in question. At least none of the arguments which we have been considering, as tending to show that what is called beauty is a subjective state, seem to apply to obligations. Obligations are not secondary qualities, nor indeed qualities of things at all. They arise out of the relations of persons, and there is nothing of whose reality we are more certain than persons. Kant, indeed, held that obligations or, as he oddly called them, the moral law, are the one kind of facts about which, and on the ground of which, we could make synthetic judgments *a priori* that could be true not only of what he calls phenomenal reality but of things in themselves. Nor is Price less emphatic in his condemnation of the "moral sense school."

One may have the pure moral experience in robbing the rich Peter to feed the starving Paul, and another in like situation might have it in resisting the temptation. And this difference may be due, like tastes in scenery, to their environment or upbringing. But once convince them that they have no duties to their neighbours and they could have no moral experience at all. On the other hand, Coleridge does not seem from his *Ode to Dejection* to have valued aesthetic experience less for being convinced that beauty lives in seeming.

Hitherto, for brevity and clearness, I have used the words obligation and duty in a general and popular sense. But certain objections, which might be suggested by the last paragraph, require to be met, and I believe can be met, by a more careful distinction. I do not feel these objections to be serious for my main point, but no doubt they have contributed to make plausible the view that obligation is a misnomer for peculiar feelings of pleasure in contemplating certain acts and characters. To begin with, obligations are in one sense mind-dependent in that they would not exist if there were no minds. They are not physical things, nor the relations of physical things or of animals to one another, if our idea of animal consciousness is correct. They arise out of the relations of

persons to one another or to other sentient beings. Secondly, there is also a sense in which they depend upon feelings, or rather presuppose that the beings in question have feelings and desires. As Hume pointed out, if all sentient creatures were secure of satisfaction for all their desires, or if they had no desires at all, at least most of our more obvious duties would disappear. I do not see, for instance, how it would be possible to owe anybody anything. At any rate, *what* we ought to do for people must largely depend upon their feelings and wants, and these will to some extent depend upon their beliefs. But since in fact there are sentient beings, some of whom are rational persons, in various relations to one another, the obligations which arise out of these relations are facts whatever anybody may feel or think about them. Thirdly, there is a more subtle sense in which our obligations might be said to depend upon our beliefs. It seems that a man cannot be morally bound to do what is impossible for him. It cannot be a surgeon's duty to give anaesthetics if none are procurable or to fly to the patient's aid if there is no aircraft. But what makes it impossible to do something may be our ignorance. Nothing else prevented our ancestors from supplying surgeons with morphia and planes. It seems more natural to say that it is our duty to give a man the dose which, after the best inquiry, we think most likely to cure him than that it is our duty to cure him. Perhaps we may say that the duties to which situations give rise are always duties to *try* to alter or maintain those situations. There is nothing subjective about this. A little more puzzling is the fact that our duties depend upon our beliefs about the situation. If I believe a man is ill, it may be my duty to try to cure him though in fact he is shamming. So, strictly, our duties would be to try to maintain or alter situations which we believe to exist; and one element in all situations which we should try to alter would be our conscious ignorance of other elements in our situation the knowledge of which might give rise to obligations. And here, too, there seems nothing subjective about the obligation. It is true that when I remind a man of a debt I am more apt to say "You owe me" or "You ought to pay me" than "I can tell you something which will make you owe me." But I should not say, "You ought to have paid me though you did not know of the debt"; rather perhaps, "You ought to have been more careful to remember." We should certainly be prepared to say that I never ceased to have a right to be paid, and it has been suggested that it would be convenient to speak of "responsibilities" or "claims upon me," of which I may be ignorant and which, when I become aware of them (in the absence of any stronger conflicting claims), give rise to duties. In none of the situations described does my duty depend upon my belief that it is my duty (which would be

absurd) or upon my feeling about the situation or the change in question. There is nothing here analogous to the doubt if beauty does not depend on thoughts and feelings. None of these considerations seem to me to make it at all plausible that, when we speak of an obligation to do something, all that is true is that we or others have a particular feeling about acts of the kind. Nor can I think of any other arguments directed to that end.

My conclusion is that our moral and aesthetic judgments differ fundamentally in this: It is at least very questionable if, on reflection, we can believe that things have what we call beauty whether anybody is affected aesthetically by them or not. All that may be true is that some or all things are capable, under certain conditions, of affecting persons in that way, as they may also be capable of affecting them with surprise or pleasure. And if this were true we should have no less reason to enjoy our aesthetic experiences or to distinguish them from other experiences or to value them in proportion to their purity. On the other hand, reflection on our moral judgments more and more convinces me that the relations in which we stand to our fellows are in objective fact grounds of real obligation. And if we could really cease to believe this, and be persuaded that when something is called our duty all that is true is that some people have certain feelings about it, the moral experience would become impossible for us. If we really sometimes are under obligations, there is goodness in acting from the belief that we are so on a given occasion; if not, not. And it seems to me undeniable that there is. But the goodness of aesthetic experience does not depend upon beauty being a quality of objects.

THE RATIONAL AND EMPIRICAL ELEMENTS IN PHYSICS[1]

PROFESSOR H. DINGLE, A.R.C.S., D.Sc.

IT is a platitude that thought implies a subject and an object: the subject is the thinker, or the thinking mind, and the object is that which is thought about. This is probably the most elementary fact of consciousness, comprehensible alike to the child, the unreflecting man of affairs, and the philosopher, and it forms the natural starting-point for philosophy. And indeed, one of the great divisions between philosophical systems is that which separates subjectivism on one hand from objectivism (more often called by the indefinite and over-burdened name, realism) on the other. Subjectivism professes to interpret the object in terms of the subject, and objectivism professes to interpret the subject in terms of the object.

It is perhaps *ultra vires* for one who is not a philosopher to make a comprehensive statement about philosophical systems, and I do so with full consciousness that my knowledge of the history of philosophy is lacking in both extension and depth. Nevertheless, even a superficial survey is sufficient to show that, as a general rule, the difference between so-called subjective and objective systems does not correspond to the difference between the subject and object which are the necessary elements of thought, but relates to alternative methods of dealing with what is entirely objective. For example, the duality of mind and matter—thinking things and extended things—introduced by Descartes is generally considered to have originated two opposite schools of thought, *idealism* and *realism*. The idealists sought to explain matter in terms of mind, and the realists sought to explain mind in terms of matter. But both mind and matter here are, with respect to the process of thought, objective. They both belong to the complex of things about which the philosopher thinks. They are together set objectively before him, and if he elects to give mind the more fundamental status in his philosophy, and thereupon calls himself a subjectivist, he no more brings the objective field of his mental operations into his own subjective self than does his brother, the materialist, who makes the opposite classification.

The reason for this anomaly is not difficult to see. By "mind" we

[1] Lecture delivered to the British Institute of Philosophy at University College, on January 18, 1938.

do not, when speaking of the Cartesian duality, mean the mind of the thinker, but something which is manifested in many individual examples, and is distinguished from matter mainly by the fact that the thinker apprehends it by other faculties than those (which we call "the senses") which reveal matter to him. Even to Berkeley there were A's mind, B's mind, . . . and the mind of God, which served, equally with his own mind which thought of them, to guarantee the existence of extended things. But mind, regarded as the subject of thought, is simply the mind of the thinker. All other so-called minds are objective to him, and therefore should not, for the purposes of philosophy, be regarded as precisely equivalent to his own mind. It is only the thinker's mind that is the subject of thought: it is the aggregate of all minds that is set against the aggregate of all matter in the Cartesian system.

The first step towards unconfused thinking, then, is to distinguish the mind of the thinker from the objective aggregate of minds about which he thinks. It is not, however, the final step, because the thinker can think of his own mind, and in that act he must therefore be both subject and object. This confusion can be removed only by analysing the mind of the thinker into subjective and objective elements. The objective elements can then go into the general objective world, where they must stand on a par with the minds of other people, and the subjective elements alone must form the subject of thought.

This analysis is made automatically by *Time*, which makes possible all consciousness, including self-consciousness. When "I" am thinking of "myself," the subject, "I," is always at the present moment, whereas the object, "myself," about which I think, is in the past; "myself" is simply the past states of "I" (or what we call the "future" states if I care to speculate). Time makes an inevitable separation of the subjective "I" from the objective "myself"; that part of my mind which (to use a familiar metaphor) travels with time is the subject, "I"; that part of my mind which remains behind in the past, and which "I" remembers, is the object, "myself." As such, myself belongs to the same class of objects as other persons. They also are separated from "I" in time, for since they are necessarily at different places, my knowledge of them, like my memory of myself, must refer to a previous instant of time, when the messenger—light, sound, or whatever it is—which brings me that knowledge issued from them.

This division, of what is usually regarded as the unity of my mind, into an eternally present subject, "I," and an objective "myself" consisting of its past states, enables us to regard the process of philosophizing in definite relation to the subject-object duality. In philosophizing, the relevant part of the subject, "I," is the logical

faculty, the reason, and the objective world about which "I" thinks consists of his past experience and whatever he can, as we say, "infer" from it by rational processes. This corresponds to the fact that the principles of logic, like the subject, "I," are timeless; they are eternally present. We do not say that $1 + 1 = 2$ at some particular time, and we do not regard a man as even possibly a prophet who says that next Christmas $1 + 1$ will be equal to 3. The principles of logic are true *now*, and "now" is the eternal characteristic of the subjective "I." On the other hand, everything about which "I" thinks, on which he exercises logical thought, has a location in time. Each of the experiences which I include in "myself" occurred to me at some moment or finite duration of time. A man who tells me that next Christmas the objective "myself" will be in Egypt is not obviously talking nonsense. All my experience, as soon as it becomes the object of thought, is elsewhere in time: "I," with the rules of logic, am always now.

This subject-object distinction must be preserved consistently in our thinking if we are to avoid contradictions. We cannot think without implying this distinction, and we must therefore be careful not to confuse the subject with the object in the system of thought we create. What I am suggesting is that, when we philosophize, logic (or reason) is the subjective element; and experience, out of which we form our notions of ourselves and other people and things, is the objective element; and that the two elements are automatically distinguished by their relation to time, which is a necessary condition of consciousness. On one hand we have subjective reason, with principles which it is obviously nonsense to regard as located in time; and, on the other, objective experience, which happened at more or less definite times, and which the rational subject, in the process of forming a philosophy, tries to bring into a rational system.

I want you, then, in order to make the ideas as definite as possible, to form a mental picture of these two elements in philosophy as distinct entities. Subjective reason, with its timeless rules of thought, is the active agent, bringing rational order into the passive chaos of experience. Experience is passive because, however vivid it may be as spontaneous experience, it is dead memory of experience when reason begins to operate on it; it has had its day, its location in time. Other experiences may occur like it, but the experience which is the object of thought is essentially past. Out of that chaos of past experience reason constructs myself, you, tables, chairs, stars, and the rest of the world, and tries to set them all in order. The various bits of experience are like the pieces of a jig-saw puzzle. The solver, reason, fits them into position, starting at many different points and obtaining many isolated groups of connected pieces, which he calls the various sciences, theology, aesthetics, and so on. The state

of the pattern at any moment is the state of his philosophy. The complete pattern is the final philosophy at which he aims.

Drawn by Mr. R. N. Seddon

"Look here upon this picture, and on this." The first is the picture we have just seen. The second picture, so far as it can be clearly delineated, represents the unsatisfactory philosophical framework into which we ordinarily try to fit the achievements of science. There is again a duality: On one hand we have *mind*, and on the other *the external world* divided into two parts by an opaque curtain. Mind tries to apprehend the external world. The part of that world in front of the curtain it has already apprehended; the part behind is the unknown, and the operations of mind consist in pushing the curtain back so as to bring more and more of the external world into the foreground of the known. We must suppose the curtain permeable by the objects which make up the external world, because mind cannot move them or alter their essential nature in any way; it can only "know" them—that is, push the curtain through them. Some objects may not be able to pass through the curtain. They remain permanently on the far side, and are called "unknowable." They may, nevertheless, be there just as truly as the objects which are known. The position of the thinker and his fellows is ambiguous in this picture. They are included in mind, because it is they who seek to know the world, but also they are a part of the world, because they seek to know themselves and each other. This was a source of perplexity to Professor Macmurray in the last lecture of this series; it is the confusion already noted, that must occur when the subject-object duality is associated with the incompatible duality consisting of mind and the external world. Further, the distinction between the thinker and other persons is not, and cannot be, represented; he is included with them in the pusher, and his distinctive subjective quality is lost.

The contrast between reason and experience, which is fundamental to the first picture, is not inexpressible in terms of the second, but, when delineated, it is inconspicuous. Reason and experience are there simply alternative instruments by means of which knowledge may be obtained; they are the two hands with which mind can push the curtain back. In other words, we may get to know the external world either by observation—experiencing it—or by logic—reasoning about it. There has been much discussion concerning which is the more trustworthy instrument, and the battle between empiricism and rationalism has been waged with an intensity rather out of proportion to the importance of a question about a mere choice of methods. It seems as though the combatants were subconsciously aware that they were concerned with something much more fundamental than the "mind-matter" view of the philosophic problem would imply.

The thesis I want to uphold in this lecture is that the intellectual activities which we call science and philosophy can be properly described only in terms of the first picture, and that what scientists and philosophers have actually been doing has been generally misrepresented by the attempt to describe it in terms of the second. We are so accustomed to regarding ourselves as minds learning as much as we can of a pre-established, independently existing world of mind and matter, and our language has shaped itself so completely to meet the needs of this view, that it is pedantic, except in fundamental philosophical or scientific discussions, to speak otherwise than in conformity therewith. Nevertheless, if we are to solve our present problems we must do so. If we examine the scientific situation, for example, we find that the difficulty is not in going ahead or in knowing what to do—there never was a time when progress was so rapid—but in understanding what it is that is being done. What I want to show is that this is a difficulty only because we try to understand it in terms of the second picture instead of the first.

Psychology is perhaps the branch of science in which this is most readily seen. In terms of the mind-matter picture, psychology seems almost impossible. It is defined as the study of the mind; but mind is that which studies, and we are at once in confusion. This consideration has prevented even the beginnings of a science of psychology until our own day, and even now, when such a science is actually in existence, its incompatibility with the second picture leads able philosophers, such as Professor Macmurray, to maintain, like the sceptical spectator of the hippopotamus, that there is no such animal. But in terms of the first picture the situation is simple. The psychologist employs his reason to examine his experience. He does not examine reason; it is no part of the psychological problem to criticize the law of contradiction. He forms himself, as well as

other people, out of experience, and does not hesitate even to form several "himselves" if the concept of multiple personality helps to make his experience rational. All this is quite unintelligible in terms of the mind-body duality.

But I am concerned this evening, not with psychology, but with physics. Here also it is the first picture that is most simply and naturally adapted to the history of the subject, but until quite recent times it has been possible to express the progress of physics in terms of the second; and physicists, I think without exception, have done so. The subjective agent, the physicist, pushes back the curtain to reveal as much as he can of the physical world. The growth of the scheme of physics is the bringing of more and more of that world into the known foreground, and the objects which successively appear there are all alike in being parts of the same independently existing structure. Two hundred years ago the planet Uranus and the atom were behind the curtain. The physicist pushed with the right hand of experience, and Uranus came into view; he pushed with the left hand of reason, and the atom appeared. But he saw no essential difference between Uranus and the atom, corresponding to the fact that they had been revealed by different means. They were of the same nature—the nature of the physical world, as Sir Arthur Eddington calls it in a description in which he treats them as having precisely the same status in the physical scheme.

As I have said, this view of the matter involved no insuperable difficulties until recent times. So lightly, in fact, had we come to regard the distinction between experience and reason, that if a physicist, chosen at random, had been asked by which instrument the electron was discovered, the chances are heavily in favour of his answering, "By experience," because its discovery was associated with a physical experiment. The fact that what the experiment showed was not electrons, but such things as green luminosity on glass tubes, would have been held to be trivial, and anyone bold enough to hint at it would have been dismissed as a tiresome quibbler. But now the whirligig of time has brought in his revenges. This electron, this bit of the physical world cognate with the immortal stars, is a wave on Mondays and a particle on Tuesdays; it is too small to see with one eye, while to the other it oscillates throughout the whole of space. There is only one thing to be done if the second picture is to be saved. These appearances must be explained away as mere protuberances on the surface of a mainly inscrutable "real" electron. They are able to pierce the curtain, but it is impervious to the rest of the structure, and further embarrassment is avoided by denying the possibility of knowledge of what the electron is in itself. Why we should think it worth while to push when "reality" is inaccessible is a question that is still in the category of quibbles.

But this is merely a particular example of the incongruity of the second picture. There is a much more general difficulty, arising from what has been called "the principle of uncertainty," according to which not electrons only, but the whole of the physical world is unknowable because the act of knowing necessarily changes it in an unknowable way. Eat of the tree of knowledge, and Paradise is no longer Paradise. The protuberant superficial particle, as well as the hidden real electron, escapes us, for we cannot know where it is until it is elsewhere. When an object passes from behind the curtain to the front, it becomes something else, and knowledge is no longer knowledge but transmutation. To such a pass have we been reduced by the attempt to express the progress of physics in terms of a gradual discovery of an independent world by means of reason and experience. And all the time we are learning more and more, and bringing more and more of our observations into a rational system.

In order to understand these anomalies we must describe the first picture in rather more detail. We have the active agent, reason, fitting together into a regular pattern the passive bits of experience which form its raw material. Let us first of all identify these bits of experience, which are unalterable in themselves, the function of reason being restricted to the establishment of relations between them. We often say that what we experience—what we "observe" —in physics are objects such as stones and metals and stars, but that is not so. The physicist takes no interest in a material object as such; he is concerned primarily with the sense data which go to compose the material object, and he deals with them separately, quite ignoring their common-sense association into stones and such things. Consider, for example, two pieces of matter, such as a drop of ink and a piece of chalk. For simplicity we can ignore most of their qualities, and regard one simply as a black fluid and the other as a white solid. But physics does not so treat them. It does not take a black fluid and a white solid as two unit pieces of the puzzle and try to fit them into position. It takes instead the blackness of the ink and the whiteness of the chalk, and fits them into a partly completed portion of the puzzle which it calls "the science of optics"; and, similarly, it takes the fluidity of the ink and the solidity of the chalk, and works them into another partly completed portion of the puzzle which it calls "kinetic theory." It constructs laws of optics which show a rational relation between the blackness and the whiteness in terms of the optical properties of some external source of illumination and such things; but it forms no laws of ink which show a rational relation between the blackness and the fluidity of that substance. The common-sense unity of the ink and that of the chalk are ignored, and the component sense data which go to form those objects are separated out and re-associated in quite a different way. We must

regard the individual pieces of the puzzle, then, as sense data—sights, sounds, motions, tastes, and the rest—and not as the familiar material objects of the world of common sense.

We now come to an important detail in which our analogy of the jig-saw puzzle must be slightly modified. In those subtle devices for wasting the philosopher's time, the pieces fit directly into one another, with no connecting medium at all. That is not the way in which the physicist correlates sense data. He does not join the blackness of the ink directly with the whiteness of the chalk. He forms an auxiliary concept called "light," which he defines in such a way that it gives rise to the sensation of blackness in one set of circumstances and to the sensation of whiteness in another. Similarly, he forms concepts of "molecular forces" which are responsible for fluidity and solidity. These concepts must be clearly distinguished from the sense data themselves. Light is not a sense datum; the sensation of sight is the sense datum, and light is the agency which we postulate in order to "account for" it. The postulation of light is an act of reason, but sense data are given to us in experience.

We must regard our puzzle-solver, then, as having at his disposal two kinds of things. There are, first, the unit pieces of the puzzle —sense data—which he must accept as they are. He cannot alter them in any way, and his object is to connect them together into a rational unity. And, secondly, there are other pieces—clips, if you like—which he can use for joining the sense data together in rational relationship. These he creates for himself, and he can alter them in any way he wishes so long as he does so consistently; that is to say, if he alters the character, the definition, of the clip called "light," for example, to facilitate the connection of blackness with whiteness, he must make that same alteration in all the clips called light in the partly completed section of the puzzle called "optics." It may happen that this is embarrassing—that, for instance, he may find that one definition of light will connect half the sensations of colour together, and another definition will connect the other half. He must then separate the two groups, go on adding sense data to each as far as he can, and wait for further progress to show how the clips may be modified so as to unite the groups again.

These two types of entity—the pieces and the clips—are respectively the empirical and the rational elements in the objective world of physics. The pieces are the individual sense data of the physicist —unchanging, unalterable, "impotent pieces of the game he plays." The clips are concepts; they include light, space, physical time, electrons, mass, and many other familiar elements of the physical scheme, and they are created and modified and destroyed at the will of the physicist acting as subjective reason.

The fundamental difficulty of understanding modern physics

comes from the fact that, because we have grown so accustomed to the second picture, these two elements have become hopelessly confused. In terms of that picture there is only one kind of element —the ordinary material object, which may be revealed by either reason or experience or both, the labour being suitably divided. Individual sense data, as such, are ignored, and the material object as a whole is taken as the type of all that is physically significant. An electron and a star and mass and space and all the rest are alike things existing independently in the objective world, and we strive to understand their nature, although we have proved that it is incomprehensible. The suggestion that an electron and a star are not of the same nature—that one is a pure creation of reason and the other an association of a few sense data clipped together by concepts such as space and physical time—is rejected because, although obviously true, it does not conform to the picture.

And yet, if we could only become simple-minded enough, there is nothing that is easier than to distinguish the elements of experience from those of reason. The former are simple sense data which we cannot change because the passage of time immediately removes them from our control, and the latter are ideas which we form and transform at our discretion. A particular sensation of green or of sourness is just what it is; we cannot alter it—we can only try to "explain" it, i.e. connect it rationally with other sensations. Concepts, on the other hand, we alter with absolute freedom within the bounds of reason. Light is a wave or a particle or whatever we want it to be in order to correlate our experiences. Space is Euclidean, or Riemannian, or Lobatchewskyan, or what not, according to the same necessity. Physical time is one thing to one "observer" and another thing to another. Electrons are goodness knows what, and I have no time to enumerate all the things they have been. And mass —according to the second picture the one fundamental, inviolable property of the material object—is first made a dependant on velocity, and then, in general relativity, abolished altogether. All this is history; it is not a hypothesis about what *may* happen; it *has* happened. And it has happened by rational action on the part of the physicist. He did not look at mass—get experience of it—in order to change it; he changed it spontaneously by his own rational act, in order to connect experiences together.

We can now see quite simply, I think, what the modern physical paradoxes mean. Take the difficulty that the electron must be both a wave and a particle. This is only a difficulty so long as we regard an electron as an independently existing physical object whose pre-established nature we try to discover. If that were true there would, of course, be a real difficulty, because the properties of waves and those of particles are incompatible. But the electron is not an

independently existing physical object. History tells us that we have invented it; it is a clip, and not one of the pieces of the puzzle. When we say that it is a wave, we mean that the concept of a wave is a suitable clip for connecting together a large number of pieces of the puzzle; and when we say that it is a particle, we mean that the concept of a particle is a suitable clip for connecting together a large number of the other pieces of the puzzle. But that is quite normal; we have never expected the same concept to connect all experiences together. That is perhaps an ideal to be aimed at as the completion of physics, but in working towards it we are content with light for optics, with space and time for kinematics, and so on. The whole difficulty, then, with the wave and the particle is simply that we have given them the same name: call them by different names, and the difficulty disappears.

The conclusion that the famous paradox of modern physics exists only because we have called different things by the same name may seem too simple to be true; yet I do not think it can be avoided. In saying that the experiences rationalized by the two concepts are different experiences, I am not inventing an explanation; I am simply stating facts which are generally acknowledged by physicists. Here, for example, is a quotation from Professor C. G. Darwin[1]: "If we devise an experiment which shows the wave properties, that experiment debars us from observing the particle properties at the same time, and *vice versa*." Or, in our own terms, the experiences which are connected together by the concept of a wave cannot be connected together by the concept of a particle, and *vice versa*.[2] And again: "An electron is a particle 'and/or' a wave. We must be ready all the time to think of it as either or both, but we must not mix the ideas." Nothing could be clearer. But when Professor Darwin goes on to say: "There is nothing of the same kind anywhere else in scientific thought" (p. 83), I cannot agree with him, because I think there is nothing of any other kind in scientific thought. We can think of "light" as the etherial wave which makes possible sight, or as the aerial wave which makes possible hearing, but we must not mix the ideas. We do not, of course, mix these particular ideas because we call the second kind of "light," "sound"; but that is the only difference between the two cases. Light is used to rationalize certain sense experiences, and sound to rationalize others. Similarly, the wave electron is used to rationalize certain sense experiences, and the particle electron to rationalize others. Give them different names, and the correspondence with light and sound is complete.

Of course, there is a reason why we gave light and sound different names, and the wave electron and particle electron the same name: it is not simple imbecility. The reason is that the sense data rationalized

[1] *The New Conceptions of Matter* (1931), p. 80. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 82.

by light and by sound are obviously of different kinds, whereas those rationalized by the concept of electrons appear at first to be of the same kind. Consequently (speaking in terms of our jig-saw picture) we started from the beginning to build sights into one pattern and noises into a quite different one, and the clips suitable for these two isolated portions of the complete design were not expected to be the same. The history of the electron, however, is somewhat different. We began to correlate certain sense data by means of the particle electron, and quite a respectable pattern soon grew up. A time came, however, when other sense data, apparently of the same kind, could be joined on only by clips with different properties—those of waves. The proper thing to do, of course, would have been to start a new group, disregarding the superficial similarity between the sense data, and keeping the pattern made possible by the particle clips separate from that made possible by the wave clips. But physicists could not do that because they were obsessed by the second of our pictures, according to which the electron was a definite, independent, unique thing. Rather than take the traditional scientific course, therefore, they elected to regard it as a contradiction, and, making a virtue of necessity, many of them congratulated themselves on having discovered scientifically that the universe was essentially mysterious.

I wish it were possible to trace out the history of the electron, to show how it is that sense data, apparently of the same kind, could require to be separated into different groups needing different concept clips to hold them together. The process is far too complicated, however, for brief treatment, but fortunately it can be illustrated by a simpler example in which precisely the same thing has happened, except that physicists have not in this case fallen into error, but have actually formed the separate groups required. I refer to the case of motion of free bodies. We observe movements, and these constitute our sense data, the unit pieces of our puzzle. We then form certain concepts—space, time, mass—by means of which we can bring them into a system: the arrangement of the connecting clips for this purpose is known as the "laws of mechanical motion," and the pattern includes the movements of the planets, of falling bodies, of projectiles, and many other things.

But now, there are some movements that do not fit into the scheme: to take an example, there are the movements of magnets in a magnetic field. I describe them in these terms so that you shall understand at once what I am talking about, but, simply as movements, they are indistinguishable from the movements of falling apples; and, apart from the laws which we have had to arrive at by exercising our reason on the sense data, we should not know one kind of movement from the other. Now these magnetic movements

will not join on to the group of mechanical ones. You can take a magnet, measure its mass in the approved fashion, give it a definite, known velocity at a known place and time, and calculate the movement which the laws of mechanics require; and you will find that it will not exhibit that movement.

Physicists have therefore kept these magnetic movements apart from the purely mechanical ones: they have created additional concepts of "magnetism" and "magnetic field," and started to form a new pattern in which these new concepts are used as connecting clips. And the essential point in all this is that there is no justification whatever for this separate treatment of similar sense data except that it works. Magnetic movements bear no label to distinguish them from mechanical ones. We cannot look at a magnet and observe its magnetism, or at the surrounding space and observe a magnetic field. There is no evidence whatever for the reality of these things except that they enable us to bring order into certain movements which disobey the laws followed by others. We are, in fact, busy now trying to abolish magnetism. For many years Einstein and others have been trying to formulate a "unified field theory" which will include magnetic and electrical movements in the laws of mechanics, and if they succeed, "magnetism" and "magnetic field" will pass into nothingness.

All this is meaningless in terms of the second picture. According to that picture we are engaged in learning all we can about magnetism, which is some entity existing in its own right, and which is now partly behind and partly in front of the curtain. The fact that we have never had any experience of it, and that all that we can say about it is derived from our attempts to make our experience of movements rational, is regarded as unimportant; it merely means that we are discovering it by pushing the left hand instead of the right. The fact that when we have brought more of it to the front it may all disappear, as mass did when general relativity came into view, can only, in terms of the second picture, be regarded as another example of the essential mysteriousness of the universe.

Now let us compare this example of magnetism with the case of the electron. In the former we have movements, originally indistinguishable, which we can fit together if we divide them into two groups, one connected by the clips, mass, space, time (or space-time alone in the latest arrangement), and the other by these same clips with the addition of others. We have condescended to make this division, and have made much progress in consequence. In the other case (that of the electron) we again have experiences, too complex to describe briefly, but again of a single kind. Here, however, we have not divided in order to conquer. Although one group can be correlated by means of the concept of a particle, and the remainder

by means of the concept of a wave, we persist in keeping them all together, even at the expense of making the common connecting clip a monstrosity: we say the electron is both a particle and a wave. If we had treated movements in the same way, we should have said that matter was both magnetic and non-magnetic, instead of that some matter was magnetic and some non-magnetic.

I do not want to stray too far beyond the boundaries of my subject, but at this point it seems fitting to refer to one of the great problems of philosophy which owes one of its commonest forms to the progress of physics. I refer to what has been called the nineteenth-century nightmare of universal determinism. The influence of physics on our attitude to this problem is well enough known; Professor Whitehead's condensed statement will serve for the purpose of setting it before us. Speaking of Tennyson's *In Memoriam*, he says: "Tennyson goes to the heart of the difficulty. It is the problem of mechanism which appals him.

'The stars,' she whispers, 'blindly run.'

This line states starkly the whole philosophic problem implicit in the poem. Each molecule blindly runs. The human body is a collection of molecules. Therefore, the human body blindly runs, and therefore there can be no individual responsibility for the actions of the body."

I think it is one of the most remarkable examples of the human power of self-deception that this argument should ever appear other than absurd, for the whole practice of physicists, even in the nineteenth century, gave it the lie direct. They had found laws which correlated certain movements—mechanical laws. Other movements violated those laws, so they were released therefrom and different laws were formed for them—magnetic laws. Still other movements obeyed neither mechanical nor magnetic laws; they were excused both and given a fresh set—electrical laws. A fourth set of movements—animal movements—obeyed none of these laws, and in this case no one succeeded in finding any laws which they did obey. And what happened? Instead of saying, "There may be no such laws, and these movements may be free," physicists and philosophers and everyone else refused to grant them even the freedom given to magnetic and electrical movements. Instead, they said mournfully, "There is no escape from the conclusion that these movements, which obviously defy the laws of mechanics, are in complete subjection thereto."

The true answer to the determinist riddle is that there is no riddle to answer. The whole difference between mechanical movements and others is that the former obey certain laws and the latter do not; there is no other difference. If, then, mechanical movements

are called blind because they can be predicted, movements which cannot be predicted must not be called blind. Molecules have nothing to do with the matter; they are conceptions introduced to correlate phenomena other than movements. What we are concerned with are the movements of pieces of matter like human bodies and stars, and we find that we can predict the movements of dead human bodies and stars, but not those of living human bodies. A child could have silenced Tennyson's Maid of Sorrow by reminding her that she was no star. Perhaps in those days children were too genteel for that; if so, Victorian gentility has no greater crime laid to its charge.

The reason for this ghastly illusion is again the domination which the false second picture held over the minds of everyone. In terms of the first picture, where the actual experiences, the observed movements, are taken as given, and laws are created by reason to bring the movements together into a rational system, it cannot even be expressed. Laws are valid just so far as they fulfil their purpose of rationalizing experiences, and no further. But in the second picture, laws are objective existences which we bring to light by pushing back the curtain; and matter, which they control, must be all alike in its subjection to them because it forms, dead and living alike, the objective element of the fundamental duality. Hence, if some matter appears lawless, that is only because we have not yet pushed the curtain back far enough to reveal its laws completely. This was a pure assumption, of course, but there had to be something corresponding to our hope that all experience is rational. The tragedy of the second picture is that that hope can be realized only by making us the slaves of alien forces, for we ourselves, the pusher of the curtain, are also matter in the objective world. But in the first picture the forces which control our objective selves are not alien, but of our own creation, and we, as subjective rational agents, stand outside them. We can escape the submission of our objective selves to them when we wish—by becoming irrational. For my own part I have no desire to do so.

The extent to which the second picture still perverts our thinking is nowhere more evident than in the recent attempts to solve the dilemma by an appeal to the principle of uncertainty. It is said that because we cannot predict the mechanical movements of matter with absolute precision, our wills may be free. But the principle of uncertainty is essentially a restriction on what we can *know*, not on what actually *is*, so that it really has nothing to do with the matter. This ostrich method of escape from an imaginary problem is one of the most curious features of modern mental activity.

I want to refer in conclusion to another very important question concerning the rational and the empirical, which can be elucidated

immediately when considered in relation to our first picture. There is a tendency among some modern physicists to regard the business of science as the discovery of laws of nature by pure reason, apart from experience. Readers of *Nature* may remember that about six months ago this question was discussed in that journal, and it was, in fact, in the throes of the resulting controversy that I chose the subject before us for my lecture this evening. Perhaps that may be accepted as my excuse for referring briefly to my own part therein.

The point which it seemed to me important to maintain was that the practice of formulating arbitrary principles unrelated to experience, and proceeding to make purely rational deductions therefrom, was not a process which could properly be called science; and that to make use of existing facilities for scientific publication and research in order to promote such practices, was illegitimate. I could have stated my case most simply and clearly in terms of our first picture, but since that is as yet unfamiliar, and almost all scientists think in terms of the second—and since, further, space forbade a preliminary description of the appropriate picture—I could only translate my contention into terms compatible with the second picture—i.e. with the idea that science is an attempt to discover the character of an independent objective world assumed to be governed by independent objective laws. In the ensuing discussion, certain points were raised which could not be properly answered in such terms because they were really concerned with the inadequacy of the second picture itself. I want, therefore, in the more advantageous position in which I am now situated, very briefly to reconsider the question in both sets of terms.

If we choose the second picture, the point does not seem of fundamental importance. Whether we push back the curtain with the right hand of experience, or with the left hand of reason, is rather trivial so long as it is pushed back and the nature of the physical world is revealed. The chief reason which is then available for insisting on the claims of experience is a historical one. The beginnings of modern science were characterized by a very successful effort by the extreme right, that which was brought into view by the left party being shown to be illusion and not knowledge. For example, reason formulated principles such as that the heavens were incorruptible and unalterable, while the earth was corruptible and variable; that a circle was the most perfect figure; and so on. From this it followed that the Sun must be spotless, and the orbits of the planets circular. That was what was brought into view by pushing back the curtain on the left. Pushing on the right, however, showed that the Sun was not spotless and the orbits of the planets were not circular. It is the second revelation, and not the first, that we now universally call knowledge.

It is precisely this same controversy that is now revived. To take a particular example, Professor Milne, of Oxford, has formulated a principle which may be expressed briefly as requiring that observers everywhere in the universe observe, on the large scale, the same course of events, so that it would be impossible for anyone to know where he was. There is no evidence for this principle, for we do not know even that there are any observers other than terrestrial ones. The principle is therefore precisely equivalent to the principle that the heavens are incorruptible, and derives the same *a priori* plausibility from the present terms of physical theories that the other principle derived from the climate of mediaeval thought. Professor Milne than proceeds to argue that we may arrive at truth by rational deduction from this principle, or similar ones, without recourse to experience. We are forced to conclude, therefore, that if an observer should be discovered empirically who had a different view of the universe from ours, his existence would have to be denied. The objection which the second picture allows us to make to this contention is that, as a matter of history, Science is the name given to the view which, in such a conflict, accepts the revelations of experience and not those of reason.

But it is in terms of the first picture that the matter is seen in the clearest light. Science is there seen as the arranging of experience into a rational system. Reason can create connecting clips as it wishes, and the particular set of clips which is able to unite a certain group of experiences into a system forms the law of nature appropriate to that group. To say that the system could be formed without the experiences would obviously be nonsense: experiences are the data of the problem, and the clips are created to conform to them. Reason could, of course, form clips (i.e. concepts) without considering the experiences—in pure mathematics, as well as in the act of inventing arbitrary principles, it does so—but in so doing it is engaged in quite another activity, which should bear its own name. To call the blind creation of clips a means of finding out how experiences can be ordered, when the experiences themselves are ignored, is absurd. Professor Milne's cosmological principle is an arbitrary creation of reason, and the forms which its own nature enables it to take may inspire a pleasant logical exercise, but that is something essentially different from science. In terms of the first picture, we have no longer a conflict between different methods for achieving the same end; the question is whether we shall seek to rationalize experiences, or amuse ourselves with fancies. I am not going to discuss the relative merits of the two occupations, but I should like to insist strongly that existing scientific societies were established and endowed for the encouragement of the former.

Sir Arthur Eddington's position in this matter is most interesting.

He maintains that "there is nothing in the whole system of laws of physics that cannot be deduced unambiguously from epistemological considerations." Like Professor Milne, therefore, he is concerned with reason alone, and not with experience, but, unlike Professor Milne, he does not create arbitrary principles on which reason can operate; he thinks rather that reason, by its own nature, can appear as physical laws—that those laws are not so much created by as shaped out of reason. In terms of the second picture, in which he professedly thinks, we must imagine the left hand, reason, as engaged, not in pushing the curtain back, but in reaching behind it and creating the physical world. The physicist, if he were intelligent enough, could without sight understand, from the movements of his left hand, what the structure of the world was, and when the right hand of experience pushed back the curtain to reveal it, only the superficial colouring would be novel: in the essentials of substance and structure, the mind of the physicist would merely have regained from nature what it had previously put in.

It is not surprising that this conception appears to many as utterly fantastic, and Eddington as the victim of illusions. I am inclined to think, however, that it is evidence of the highest genius. For let us consider how the conception appears in relation to our first picture. Here we see the laws of nature, just as Eddington conceives them, as the work of reason: they are the contribution, not of an external world, but of the physicist, the agent, and are essentially different from experiences, which have to be accepted as they are. This is an elementary feature of the first picture, *but Eddington has deduced it from the second.* In spite of the limitations and essential defects of that picture—which, so far as I know, no other scientific philosopher who adopts it has succeeded in transcending—he has seen into the heart of the matter, and has dared to become a fool that he may be wise. He has even, according to his latest pronouncements, realized that not only laws of nature, but also such things as protons and electrons, are creations of reason, and, as he puts it, are not parts of an objective universe. How he has seen through the intricate and obscure convolutions of the second picture that so consistently obstructs his vision, and observed this essential fact, I do not know; I can only, with genuine admiration, applaud the achievement.

It seems to me very probable that the *detailed* elucidation of the paradoxes of modern quantum theory awaits Eddington's abandonment of the second picture for the first. When his genius finds a field of operations made to its measure, we may expect enlightenment. At present its activities are not only hindered, but perverted. His realization of the truth that laws of nature are constructed by reason leads him to the error that reason might have constructed them

without experience. "An intelligence," he says, "unacquainted with our universe . . . should be able to attain all the knowledge of physics that we have attained by experiment." A glance at the first picture is sufficient to show the fallacy here. Such an intelligence could certainly construct the whole of physical theory, but it could also construct a thousand alternative physical theories. It could form the laws of the universe of experience, and also the laws of Professor Milne's universe and of any other universe it was able to imagine; and, without experience, it would have no criterion for preferring one set of laws to another. Eddington's statement is not wrong; it is simply valueless. The possessor of a dictionary should be able to write all the philosophical truths that can be expressed in the English language; but what is the use of that if he cannot distinguish them from errors?

There is much to say on this subject, in which physics and philosophy meet. I would recommend the first of my two pictures to the consideration of philosophers for two reasons; first, because it shows a distinction between the subjective and the objective which corresponds directly to the distinction between subject and object which is necessary to thought; and secondly, because it provides the only philosophical form in which modern physics can be expressed without inconsistency.

WOULD PLATO HAVE APPROVED OF THE NATIONAL-SOCIALIST STATE?[1]

PROFESSOR R. F. ALFRED HOERNLÉ.

LIKE all my generation at Oxford, in the far-away years of the turn of the century, I received my first introduction to the Philosophical Theory of the State through the reading of Plato's *Republic*. There followed Aristotle, Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, Hegel, Bosanquet—with a disapproving glance at Mill and Spencer. Alongside this survey of widely varying theories there ran a lively interest in the politics of the day under a "democratic," i.e. parliamentary, system of government, with much experience of "democratic" methods in the running of various college and university societies, the officials of which were elected by the members, and the actions of which were determined, after discussion, by majority vote.

If there was any connecting link, on the one hand between the diverse theories themselves, and on the other hand between these theories and our actual democratic practice, it was perhaps this: We accepted the Aristotelian premise that the State exists to make the "good life" possible for its members; we were led on thence to the problem of "knowing" just what the good life in detail is; we found Rousseau saying that the people always wills the good, but does not always know what it is. Looking back from this point at Plato's *Republic*, we found him proposing to secure this knowledge in the persons of his finely bred and highly trained philosopher-kings, who coupled with their knowledge the power to give effect to it in the ruling of the State by having the support of an armed body of "auxiliaries" or "helpers." Looking forward to Hegel and Bosanquet, we found ourselves told that this knowledge is concretely embodied in the established institutions and laws of the State, expressing that "general will" which is, by definition, the will for the good of the community as a whole. Turning our backs, then, on Plato's philosophic dictators, we made a contact between this "general will" doctrine and the current "democratic" theory and practice, by looking upon the machinery of parliamentary government as the institutional organ for continuous adjustment, i.e. for maintaining, or modifying where necessary, the whole institutional

[1] The substance of this paper was delivered, as a Presidential Address, before the Philosophical Society of the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa, in April, 1937.

framework so as to keep on realizing the "good life" in a changing world.

In other words, we idealized democracy in its parliamentary form, and in this mood excused Plato's severe strictures on democracy on the ground that they applied only to democracy as he had known it, i.e. to government by primary assemblies of all citizens. And from his advocacy of an enlightened dictatorship we carried away only the ideals of trained efficiency, devotion to duty, and public spirit overriding the acquisitive motive, which ideals we took to be adequately realized in a healthy Civil Service.

What a dictatorship, even a Platonic one, in practice would be like, and how it would impact on our democratic habits of thought and action, we hardly tried to imagine. Historical examples of dictatorship or autocratic rule looked to us more like what Plato had called "tyranny," in contrast with the rule of philosopher-kings. The last thing we then expected was that we should live to see great modern states governed by dictators, or that once more dictatorship should be deliberately put forward as the salvation of humanity from the evils of democracy. Just here lies the sting: our modern dictators claim in effect to be, not "tyrants," but philosopher-kings; men with a *Weltanschauung*, with a scheme for the spiritual salvation of their peoples, with a formulated theory of what is good for their peoples, or even for humanity as a whole; men who justify their unscrupulous use of force, their ruthlessness in moulding their subjects to the pattern of their ideals and in stamping out all opposition, precisely by the good that they seek to realize, not for themselves personally, but for the peoples over whom they rule.

This present-day historic experience brings Plato's theory from heaven down to earth, and invites us to a comparison which may illuminate his theory by modern practice, and *vice versa*. Hence, the real topic which I wish to discuss under the cover of the title of this address is the theory and practice of dictatorship, making Plato's theory and modern practice mutually throw light on each other. I shall draw my illustrations of contemporary dictatorship from National-Socialist Germany, because I happen to have some first-hand knowledge of the working of dictatorship there. Had I equal knowledge of the Italian, or again the Russian, systems, I might have used either of them just as effectively for the purpose of this study.

* * * * *

We may conveniently enter upon our study by meeting, at the very outset, a possible but irrelevant objection. I am sure to be asked: "Do you seriously mean to suggest that Plato's philosopher-kings would have been men like Mussolini and Hitler, like Lenin or

Stalin, or that they would have held the theories of any one of these? And, if you do not mean this, is not the bottom knocked out of your comparison?"

My reply to this objection is twofold. In the first place, I am interested in a comparison of systems, methods, techniques of government; of the devices of organization and education by which dictators, inspired by a *Weltanschauung* (be it that of Plato or any other), impose that *Weltanschauung* on the community over which they rule and secure its acceptance—if not in the sense of conviction of its truth, then at least in the sense of conformity to it in practice.

And, secondly, we have to note that our modern dictators stand to their loyal followers, to those who "believe" in them, in exactly the same position in which Plato's philosopher-kings would have stood to the lower orders in Plato's Ideal State. Plato postulates for the stability and cohesion of his State through the rank and file of his citizen-body the virtue of "sophrosyne," i.e. that "healthy-mindedness" one of the aspects of which is the "agreement" of the citizens that the philosopher-kings are fittest to rule, and that it is the citizens' duty to obey unquestioningly what in their "wisdom" (which is knowledge of what is for the good of the city as a whole) the philosopher-kings ordain. Plato's rank-and-file citizen is, for lack of "reason" and "wisdom," unable to judge for himself the decisions and actions of the philosopher-kings, and he would certainly not have been allowed to do so. This is exactly that same attitude of unquestioning loyalty to a "leader," of absolute faith in his wisdom, which the modern dictators ask and seek to inculcate. We may be sure—though Plato is not explicit on the point—that his philosopher-kings would have disciplined a recalcitrant citizen exactly as he proposes that they should deal with an artist who should refuse to conform to their standards of wholesome poetry and music. Obviously, Plato's philosopher-kings would have regarded such nonconformists as "enemies of the people," *Volksschaedlinge* in the German phrase; and whether they would have been killed or exiled or put in concentration camps is a mere detail of technique, governed by expediency. What is the purpose of the armed helpers in Plato's Ideal State, in their relation to the "internal enemies of the city," except to execute, at the behest of the philosopher-kings, such moral and social surgery on infection-spots of spiritual disease?

Thus, it is beside the point to demand a comparison between the actual *Weltanschauung* and policy of Plato's philosopher-kings and those of our modern dictators. We know nothing of these things for the philosopher-kings, except what little Plato tells us; and that little few, if any, of us would be prepared to apply even if we had the power to do so. And it is equally beside the point to reject the comparison on the ground that we personally happen to disagree

with the philosophy of Fascism, or National-Socialism, or Communism, as the case may be, and therefore refuse to compare any leader who holds one of these philosophies with a Platonic philosopher-king. What we are concerned with is the fact of dictators with philosophies striving to realize these in the lives of their peoples by appropriate organization of their states. It matters not in the least whether we agree with these philosophies and think them true, or not: what matters is that we are confronted by *Weltanschauungen* ("ideologies") *in action*, with all the ruthless driving force and energy of fanatic dictators behind them—ruthless fanatics, just because they conceive themselves to be vessels of absolute truth and through that truth saviours of the souls of their peoples.

The same point may be made, from another angle, by invoking Plato's distinction between the true philosopher-king and the tyrant. Both are dictators, in the sense that they wield absolute power supported by military force. But this is the only point they have in common. For the tyrant is obeyed only because he can enforce obedience by physical force: the philosopher-king, as we have already noticed, is a "leader" who can rely on the loyal obedience of his people. The tyrant has no philosophy, no vision of the good; he uses his power for personal aggrandisement and the indulgence of his private lusts: the philosopher-king knows what the welfare of his State requires and makes himself the selfless instrument of this high service. The tyrant is morally utterly depraved, the slave of his own undisciplined desires: the philosopher-king is master of himself, and therefore fit to be the master of others. The modern dictators may seem to be "tyrants" to those who do not share their philosophies and whom they persecute. But this is not to be a "tyrant" in Plato's sense of the word; for, if persecuting dissenters is being a "tyrant," then the philosopher-kings on occasion have to be tyrants too. Taking the word "tyrant" in the strict Platonic sense, it is obvious that the modern dictators, as apostles of a philosophy of life, are much more nearly akin to his philosopher-kings than to his "tyrants." And so we come back to the point: the philosopher-king of the *Republic* is best understood by analogy with the modern dictator who is, or claims to be, a "leader" and is obeyed by his genuine followers because of their faith in him and the good for which he stands, and which for them, and with their help, he strives to realize.

* * * * *

Turning, then, after these preliminaries, to the technique of dictatorship, what points of similarity between the Platonic and the National-Social systems can we discover?

There is, first, the *authoritarian* principle in the name of the good

of the people, which has for its negative side the rejection of government by majority vote as a system which enables the sectional interests of selfish persons or groups to be achieved under the guise of the "will of the people," still supposed to be the will for the good of the whole. In short, according to the authoritarian principle, the good which the people wills is to be interpreted and realized, not by the majority vote at some election or in the lobbies of Parliament, but by the decision and command of a public-spirited dictator who leads the people to their own good.

Look at the Platonic picture in the *Republic*. The philosopher-kings rule with absolute authority. They do not consult the people; they are not elected by the people; they cannot be removed by the people; they are not, in parliamentary language, "responsible" to the people. They are a self-perpetuating body, recruiting themselves by co-option from among the younger men and women whose training through something like thirty years they have supervised; whom they have moulded and tested, harder than iron is tested in the fire, as the Platonic phrase has it. Their rule justifies itself by its supreme efficiency. In detail they rule and are obeyed, because (*a*) they are "wise," i.e. they "know" what is good for the State as a whole, and their lives are so organized that they have no other interest than to serve the State in this spirit; (*b*) they have an armed body of trained fighters at their command to enforce their decisions by force, if need be; and (*c*) they are willingly obeyed by the rest of the community in that spirit of "sophrosyne" of which loyalty to a leader seems the modern equivalent. It is the function of the philosopher-kings in the Ideal State to declare what the welfare of the people requires and to give effect to their judgment by legislation and command. It is the function of the people to obey and to follow. Their consent to particular measures is not asked. For them to think about politics would be to meddle in things beyond their competence. Least of all are they allowed to pursue sectional interests by political pressure through their votes. The philosopher-kings and the helpers (the two highest classes in Plato's State) are roughly the analogon of the modern dictator and the close-knit, disciplined *Partei* (be it the Communist Party in Russia, the Fascist Party in Italy, or the N.-S. Party in Germany) through which the dictator rules.

In this light look at the National-Socialist picture: The supreme leader, assisted by a group of sub-leaders, rules the *Partei*, and through the *Partei* the State. The cabinet (the leader and the most important sub-leaders) makes laws by proclamation. There is, apart from the army proper, the armed S.S. (*Schutzstaffel*) force to deal with recalcitrant and "subversive" elements. It is linked with the *Geheime Staatspolizei* (Secret Police) which noses out and suppresses

all a-social and anti-social movements, i.e. all movements whatever which, like even Freemasonry, are regarded as hostile to the N.-S. *Weltanschauung*. It isolates all enemies of the people in concentration camps, unless they have incurred the death penalty. The rest of the *Partei* functions as a leaven for moulding the attitude of the mass of the people. Each individual member has the function of being a leader in his own small circle: a living point of faith, communicating itself from him to those around him. He has to guide, to watch, to exhort, to warn, to denounce, as the case may be. He is responsible for the spiritual health (according to N.-S. prescription) of his social environment, at once a pattern and a stimulus and a censor. If we think of National-Socialism as a religion, of the Party as a church, of the leaders in various grades as the clerus, all this will begin to wear a familiar look, and we shall realize that we have once more before us the experiment, already so often tried in history, and especially in religious history, to propagate a faith among a people, and whilst doing so to maintain at once its burning fervour and its orthodoxy. Every such faith, whatever outsiders may think of it, is accepted by its adherents with the conviction of its absolute truth. It is to them the one thing that gives meaning to life; the one thing that "saves" them; the one thing that will save others too, if they will but accept it. That is why its adherents persecute dissenters with a good conscience as enemies of the truth and the light. That is why they make themselves contented servants of the authoritarian principle.

Would it have been otherwise in Plato's Ideal State, if that could have been realized on earth?

It is, of course, true that occasional "elections," really popular *referenda*, have been, and will no doubt continue to be, held in Germany, to which there is no parallel in the Platonic State. At these elections the people are supposed to have an opportunity of expressing whether they are satisfied with the present system and its policy, or not. But in fact the questions put, which have to be answered "Yes" or "No," have always been such that an affirmative answer was a forgone conclusion; and, anyhow, intensive propaganda and other forms of pressure have been employed to secure an almost 100 per cent affirmative poll. It is said that when the time comes for a successor to Hitler to take over, the new leader will similarly submit himself to popular approval. No doubt on that occasion again skilful propaganda will do its work; and it should be obvious that these carefully prepared and staged *referenda* are merely an additional device in the service of the authoritarian principle.

* * * * *

In respect of the *details of the organization* of Plato's State, the

parallel with the National-Socialist State is, on the face of it, not very close. Nor is this to be expected when we bear in mind the great differences between the Athens of Plato's time and a modern nation-state of over sixty million inhabitants. There is nothing exactly like Plato's three classes of citizens, each with its own function and "virtue." Even the comparison made above between the *Partei* and the two highest classes in Plato's Ideal State, which do in fact the work of government and administration, is only true in a loose sense, in that there are countless officials of all kinds in Germany who do not belong to the *Partei*, though they have to carry out their duties according to its principles, and under the control of superiors who are members of the *Partei*.

But, in one respect, the parallel is close, viz. in that Plato's governing classes are conceived as a selected *élite*, and this is exactly what the *Partei*, too, is one day to be. It is not that *now*, unless we choose to say that anyone who is heart-and-soul convinced of the N.-S. faith thereby shows his superiority to the rest of his *Volksgenossen*. But actually, as Hitler himself has repeatedly admitted, the membership of the *Partei*, even at the moment of *Machtuebernahme*, contained a majority of individuals who, however sound and zealous in the faith they might be, did not possess the technical qualifications for responsible positions in the government service. This, as well as fear of the dilution of the *Partei* by the accession of numbers of insincere time-servers and careerists, are the reasons why admission to the *Partei* by way of application for membership has for some time now been discontinued, and the *Partei* of the future is to be built up by selected recruitment from among the young people who in the various youth organizations have shown themselves to be of the right physical, mental, and moral calibre. It will take a generation to effect the transformation of the present *Partei* into the desired *élite*, but ultimately it is to consist of men—and presumably women, too[1]—who have shown under rigorous tests that their faith in the principles of the *Partei* is like a rock; that their devotion to the leader is beyond doubt; and that their *Leistungen* (the quality of their work), physically and mentally, are first-class. Then, and only then, will the *Partei* fulfil the ideal of being a perfect instrument of government in the service of the ideals of National-Socialism. And then it will correspond very closely indeed, in its quality and function, to Plato's governing classes, especially if we include among the functions of its members, not

[1] Though there is a *Reichsfrauenfuehrerin*, and though the *Partei* has women members and uses them for its work, still the supreme body of leaders is intended to consist of men only, and the N.-S. ideal for women is the *Hausfrau*, the wife and mother.

merely specific administrative and legislative duties, but also the task of being at once guardians and propagators of N.-S. faith.

* * * * *

And this brings us to a third point. Whatever else Plato's Ideal State may be, it is a *school.* Its major function is to *educate* its citizens, i.e. to train the successive generations of growing boys and girls in those preferences and aversions, those moral and aesthetic principles of conduct, which, once acquired like an "indelible dye"—surely a memorable and revealing metaphor, this!—will thereafter govern their lives and make them model citizens, according to the pattern of human perfection envisaged by Plato. It is a commonplace for students of Plato's *Republic* that the aim of his elementary education is to inculcate "character," defined as "holding fast to the beliefs" by which, as citizens, men and women are to live. In other words, Plato proposes to mould the souls of his citizens to a scheme of values to which ever after they shall be true. He proposes to give them what every great religion has sought to give its adherents, viz. a *Weltanschauung* which shall be not merely a theory about the universe, but also, and even more urgently, a working faith to live by.

Now this is exactly what every modern dictatorship is also trying to do. Hence, every one of them—Communist, Fascist, National-Socialist—is first and foremost a vast educational enterprise, seeking to dominate and mould to its pattern the minds of growing youth, and fighting with all its power any rival claimant for this all-important office. The middle-aged, who have grown up in a different *Weltanschauung* and are no longer open to conviction, are generally left alone by these dictatorships so long as there is passive acquiescence and no open opposition. Death will in due course remove the present generation of inward dissenters, of those who are half-hearted and half-convinced, of doubters and critics. All our modern dictatorships look to the future and seek to conquer that future by rooting themselves securely in the minds of the growing generation.

It was exactly in this spirit that Plato proposed to envelop the minds of the young in a "health-giving" atmosphere; and to that end to censor all art and literature and, in short, the whole cultural life of the people, in order that the young might be taught to believe in, value, work for, fight for, die for, the things which he held to be "good" and "beautiful," and to avoid, abhor, reject, destroy, all things "ugly" and "vicious." Is not all this repeated precisely in the educational efforts of our modern dictatorships, except that the "good" and the "beautiful" receive varying interpretations, according as the context is Communist or Fascist or National-Socialist?

At any rate, in National-Socialist Germany we find the greatest

emphasis on *character*-education as far more important than the training of the intellect. We find the Platonic conception of "character" as unshakable firmness of belief, or faith, in the right, i.e. the N.-S., principles—a firmness which shows itself not least in unquestioning readiness to act on these principles, be the cost what it may. We find the Platonic emphasis on systematic physical education, both for its physical and its moral effects—for the building of healthy constitutions and for the development of a spirit of hardness and grit in the face of pain, danger, and obstacles that tax the last resources of strength and determination. It is, in fact, character in the sense which in the Great War we learned to call "morale," which is the aim of Plato's education, no less than of that of N.-S. Germany.

In the same spirit the campaign for the "purification" of literature and art in N.-S. Germany runs on Platonic lines, with just this difference of nuance that, whereas Plato distinguishes only between what is, from his point of view, morally good and morally bad, N.-S. censorship applies a second standard of judgment, often in practice coinciding, but not logically identical, with the first, viz. the standard of what is "racially" germane to the German soul as against what is *volksfremd* and *artfremd* (alien to the essential nature of German *kultur* and to the soul of the German people). Inevitably the range of application of such a policy of moral censorship is far greater than it was in Plato's time. There are not only books, periodicals, the daily press to be kept free from morally infectious matter; or music of a non-German, or even non-Nordic or non-Aryan, type to be eliminated from concert platforms and opera houses. There are also museums to be expurgated, films to be censored, and the content of broadcasting programmes to be kept in line. Nor is it enough to be negative, merely to prevent evil from slipping in. The good is to be positively propagated, by educational films, educational broadcasts, doctored news services, special exhibitions to warn the public against the horrors of Communism or the dangers of the falsification of German literature, music and art, by Jewish influences. Whatever literature is issued by the *Partei*, whether for its own members, or for use in the organizations, like the *Hitlerjugend*, through which it strives to spread its spirit, is full of this moral propaganda. Texts out of Hitler's *Mein Kampf* are regularly made the basis of moral instruction among the members of the *S.S.* Indeed, quite literally that book takes the place which the Bible holds in a Christian scheme of education. One of the most curious and most insidious forms of this educational propaganda consists in its inculcation of the modern German race theories, seeking not only to instil aversion and hostility to Jews and other non-Aryans, but positively to encourage an admiration for the "Nordic" type

and a desire to multiply Nordic features by selective breeding (*aufnorden, Aufnordung*). Anti-Semitic papers, like the notorious Streicher's *Stuermer*, with its repulsive representations of Jewish types, belong here just as much as many other papers with pictures of fair-haired Nordic men and women, to serve as models of the qualities which young men and women should look for in their partners for marriage. The German people are being taught to be race-conscious to an ever-increasing degree. More and more are coming to look, in themselves and in others, for the physical marks of one or more of the four to six "races" (the experts differ somewhat in their enumeration) which are included under the general concept of "Nordic" or "Aryan" race. It is no uncommon experience to be told by some race enthusiast that one belongs, e.g., to the "faelische" race with a slight "dinarische" *Einschlag* (admixture), or whatever else the combination of race marks may be!

To return, however, to the topic of education: whether we call the effort to communicate or spread a faith or a *Weltanschauung* "education" or "propaganda" is a question of words. In any case, the *Partei* is—as Plato's governing classes would have been, too—an organization, not merely for translating a certain *Weltanschauung* into practice, but also and even more for backing this practical achievement by the corresponding set of beliefs in the minds of those who have to live by its pattern of values. Hence, the air in Germany is full of the word *Schulung* (schooling). The *Partei* schools its own members, every one of whom has to attend, at least once a year, a *Schulungstag*, at which speakers, officially trained and authorized by Goebbels' Propaganda Department, address the members on topics of internal and external policy from the point of view of *Partei* principles. In a sense, these meetings may be said to serve the purposes of "revival": devotion to *Partei* principles is confirmed anew and freshly stimulated in an atmosphere which seeks to vivify *esprit de corps*, and thus strengthen the cohesion of the members among themselves and their loyalty to the leader. Plato mentions nothing similar, but we can hardly doubt that, among the many details which he proposed to leave to his philosopher-kings for determination, they would have found it necessary to devise an analogous technique for keeping the flame of faith burning brightly. There are *Schulungslager* for Civil Servants, for employers and employees, for school teachers—in short, for all and sundry who, though not members necessarily of the *Partei*, are none the less through their work in a position to advance, or counteract, the practical application or theoretical inculcation of National-Socialist principles. And as for the future leaders themselves, the proposed arrangements for their rigorous selection and elaborate training in a succession of *Burgen* ("castles," or rather castle-schools) are too

complicated to be briefly summarized here. This scheme does not repeat Plato's proposals for a sound training in the sciences to be followed by a training in philosophy. But it does agree with his scheme in the two fundamental features of the strictest possible selection of the human material to be trained, and a course of training which will make them fit champions of the *Weltanschauung* by which they have to live, which they have to propagate, and in the light of which they have to administer the affairs of the German people.

* * * * *

In one very important respect, the emphasis of modern National-Socialism is very different from that of Plato. It can hardly be denied that Plato wished his two governing classes (collectively called "the guardians") to be definitely segregated and set apart from the great bulk of the citizen body—the economic classes, the farmers, artisans, traders, etc. The lives of the guardians were to be lived on lines even more completely different from the lives of the common people than are the lives of the Roman Catholic clergy different from the lives of the laity. Dwelling apart from the rest of the citizens in barracks; joining in common meals; sustained by maintenance grants sufficient for their needs, but eliminating the acquisitive motive from their lives; deprived of family life and called upon to mate, regardless of personal preferences, so as to beget well-bred offspring to inherit the desired guardian qualities—the guardians are clearly conceived as a *caste* apart from, and above, the other citizens. Not so in National-Socialist Germany. It is, perhaps, because the leaders of National-Socialist Germany are keenly aware of the latent hostility, suspicion, even fear, with which large numbers of Germans of the older generations regard the *Partei* and all its activities, that they appreciate the danger of the *Partei* developing into a caste apart, a secret society the members of which are bound to each other by exclusive loyalties and enjoy exceptional privileges. At any rate, efforts are being made to prevent the distinction of *Parteigenosse* and *Volksgenosse* growing into a complete split. No doubt the *Partei* is to be an *élite* in order to be fit to carry on its work for Germany. But its members are not to lose touch with the non-Party rank and file. Family life is maintained. Most of the members have to earn their livings by the exercise of some profession. They are to continue to feel one with the people and the people one with them. There is to be *Kameradschaft*. They are to form an integral part of the *Leidensgemeinschaft* of the German people—of one blood with them, of one soul with them, suffering together with them the historic fate of a people encircled by enemies. In every possible way the *Partei* seeks to keep itself before the

people and to get the people, if only as spectators and flag-waggers, to share in its parades and processions, its ceremonials and rituals. The *Partei* is ever explaining itself to the people, in a way which one can hardly imagine that Plato's guardians would have found necessary. The whole *Bewegung* is almost frantically anxious to assert its character as a popular movement, a German movement, a movement by Germans for Germany. There is something demagogic about its propaganda methods in this respect which it is inconceivable that Plato's guardians should have adopted. And yet, though the technique of solution might have been different, Plato's guardians, too, would have had to face the problem of gaining, and retaining, the "agreement" of the people to their rule. For a disgruntled people rendering unwilling obedience does not make a stable State.

* * * * *

Lastly, in respect of *economic policy*, one point of similarity at least may be noticed in that the leaders of National-Socialism are, like Plato, alive to the threat to the internal unity of a State which lies in extreme differences of wealth in the population. A city some members of which are very rich, whilst others are very poor, is, says Plato, a city divided against itself; is really "two cities" under the outward form of one. National-Socialists reject, as is well known, the Communist theory of class-war. But they are keenly alive to the fact of class-war itself, and have, in their particular type of Socialism, their own recipe for overcoming it. This is not the place to go into the details of N.-S. policy by which they justify their title to the name "Socialism," i.e. into the measures by which they seek to secure a greater measure of social and economic justice for the working classes and thus to strike at the roots of the "class-war," by removing, or at least alleviating, its causes. Let us note merely that part of their moral propaganda is an effort to appeal to the fellow-feeling of Germans for each other as a solvent of the antagonism between employer and employee; that their slogan, *Gemeinnutz vor Eigennutz* (common good before private good), and their constant calls on the *Opferwille* (will to make sacrifices) of all sections of the people, do touch responsive chords in many hearts, even in circles which are otherwise reluctant to surrender to the N.-S. gospel. No doubt, reality, here as under other systems, falls far short of the ideal professed. But it would be a grievous mistake to overlook the countless organized social welfare activities, which are largely run by the voluntary labour of men and women whose public spirit and love of their own land and people have been freshly aroused, and which are conceived in the spirit of *einer fuer alle und alle fuer einen*

(each for all and all for each). At any rate, whilst we do not know just how Plato's philosopher-kings would have discharged the task laid upon them of guarding the city against great wealth and great poverty for the sake of greater internal stability and cohesion, we must note that National-Socialist Germany is trying to develop its own technique for dealing with this very problem, and that in its appeal to *national* feeling it has a resource at its disposal which, so far as we can judge, would not have been available to Plato's philosopher-kings.

* * * * *

In conclusion, it may not be irrelevant to draw attention to the fact that three N.-S. thinkers of very different type have tried to relate their N.-S. thinking to Platonic *motifs*.

The first is Theodor von der Pfordten, who would seem to have been easily the most highly educated and able of the sixteen "martyrs" who lost their lives outside the *Feldherrnhalle* in Muenchen, on that fateful Ninth of November, 1923, when Hitler's attempt to seize power by a *coup d'état* was defeated by the machine-guns of the police and garrison of Muenchen. Together with his fellows he now lies in a bronze sarcophagus in one of the two open-air temples on the *Koenigsplatz* in Muenchen. In his lifetime he appears from his writings to have been the best type of German Civil Servant, *pflichtbewusst*, i.e. profoundly convinced that he owed to his work for the State and, through the State, for the German people, the very best that he had it in him to give; and hence a hater of all incompetence, charlatanism, and the unscrupulous wangling of ambitious climbers. One of the few articles which he has left behind him is entitled (in translation) "Plato's Ideal of the Civil Servant (*Beamte*) and its significance for the present time." In it he reviews the proposals of the *Republic* and estimates, with the shrewd common sense of the experienced administrator, the practicability or impracticability of their application in modern Germany. Characteristically, he comes to the conclusion that there is no remedy for the many post-war ills of Germany other than to be ruled by men who should have a definite conception of the measures and policies by which Germany's recovery from the wounds of the War and the Peace might be secured, and who should dedicate their lives to her service with the same selfless devotion and efficiency which Plato had pictured in his philosopher-kings. Such was at least one German's path into the ranks of the followers of Hitler.

The next is Hans F. K. Guenther, well known as the most prominent of German race-theorists. He has devoted a special booklet, *Platon als Hueter des Lebens*, to an interpretation of certain

features of Plato's theories, especially in the *Republic*, in terms of his own emphasis on the importance of blood purity, race purity, and the dependence of high intellectual and moral qualities on superior blood or race. The sub-title is sufficient indication of the orientation of the argument: "Plato's thoughts about breeding and education and their significance for the present time." He begins by emphasizing the analogy between Plato's philosopher-kings and the modern "leaders," and hence the importance of the problem of securing leaders of the right innate, or inherited, quality and then giving them the right training. But from this point onwards he gives to Plato's suggestions for breeding for quality, and to Plato's warnings against mixing superior and inferior stocks, a definite twist in the direction of his own race theories; and at the same time he enlarges the scope of the principle beyond the relatively small leader group, so as to apply them to the whole population, as a racial group out of which the leaders have to be born and selected. He justifies this twist very ingeniously by the suggestion that, though Plato did not talk in the language of race differences, this is none the less what, in fact, he must have had in mind, in the light of the deterioration of the population of Greece which Plato must have himself observed. What had happened in Greece, according to Guenther, was that a superior race of Nordic invaders, the Hellenes, had established themselves as lords over an inferior aboriginal population, and that this superior race then partly destroyed itself in war, especially in the Peloponnesian war, and partly corrupted its quality by intermarriage with members of the inferior aboriginal race. It is this phenomenon against which he takes Plato's theory of the inherited differences in the natural endowments of men and his scheme for the selective breeding of future leaders to be directed. In short, Plato is really for Guenther an advocate of *Aufnordung*, who would have selected for his guardian class the purest Nordics in the population, compelled them to breed among themselves, and segregated them as completely as possible from the mass of the citizens of inferior racial type and endowment. It would be extremely interesting for some competent scholar, who both knows his Plato and has studied the problem of race, to examine Guenther's argument in detail, in order to determine how much, if anything, there is in his suggestion. I have neither the space, nor do I feel competent, to do so here. Hence, I will content myself with the abstractly logical point that, even in a racially homogeneous population, there will be a sufficiently wide spread of innate ability to allow of the classification of this group, *ex hypothesi* pure in blood, into classes differing in quality, and thus of the application even to such a group of the Platonic sorting-out of citizens according to ability and function, and the Platonic proposals for mating the superior individuals with

each other. In other words, Plato's scheme can be read in a purely biological and psychological context, without bringing in any "racial" interpretation at all. I do not say that such an interpretation would be logically inconsistent with Plato's scheme: but it certainly seems to be logically independent of it.

Thirdly, there is H. A. Grunsky's *Seele und Staat*, which in its very title announces that it borrows its main *motif* from Plato. But Grunsky, whilst adopting the Platonic principle that the structure of the soul reflects the structure of the State and *vice versa*, gives to this principle an entirely novel application. Instead of Plato's three "elements" or "forms" in the soul, Grunsky has four "poles" or dynamic tension-points; and instead of Plato's three classes in the State, he acclaims, as the correlates of the relations between these four poles, various political and social relations taken from contemporary life, such as the relations of "leader" to "followers," of artist to his public, of man to woman, of child to father and to mother, etc. It would take too long here, and be moreover hardly relevant to the main argument, to describe these poles in detail; and without detail the analysis might well appear so artificial and even fantastic that no justice would be done to the good points in it. Suffice it to put the main point—the moral, as it were—of the whole enterprise: the four poles give Dr. Grunsky ample scope for postulating various degrees of harmony and disharmony, of tension and dominance, between them, to each of which degrees some actual type of "soul," *Weltanschauung*, and culture is then made to correspond. The range of variation of which the scheme allows is such that it has room for the differences between the "souls" of different peoples or nations and of different races (like the Aryan and the Mongolian race, instanced by the author); even of different *Weltanschauungen*, such as that of the National-Socialist, the "bourgeois liberal" and humanitarian, and the Communist, leading to the conclusion that the National-Socialist type of soul is the only truly healthy and well-balanced soul, and that the Communist soul is of all souls the most unhealthy and corrupt. The external parallel to Plato's ladder of descent from the soul of the philosopher-king to the soul of the tyrant will readily be recalled. In both cases, the degeneration is said to be from order in the soul to disorder, from mental and moral health to moral sickness.

These references to the writings of National-Socialist thinkers may at least show how curiously the leaven of Platonic thoughts is working in the medium of experience and reflection coloured by the National-Socialist outlook. Even Grunsky's argument, though it may seem at first like a mere persiflage and caricature of Plato, is offered seriously as a modern reapplication of Plato's profound truth of the parallelism of Soul and State; and not without reason has

the author been entrusted with a Professorship for the presentation of N.-S. *Weltanschauung* at the University of Muenchen.

* * * * *

Returning from this digression in conclusion to our starting-point, let us repeat the question: What would Plato have thought of the National-Socialist State, or of any other modern dictatorship, were he able to return and witness it? Would he have approved of the authoritarian principle; the destruction of democratic institutions; the denial of freedom of thought and belief (at least in all matters touching the prescribed *Weltanschauung*); the transformation of education into an instrument of propaganda and indoctrination; the control of all literature, art, press, even universities, in the service of an official orthodoxy; the suppression of all criticism and opposition? Would he, perhaps, have said that his philosopher-kings would have much to learn, as regards the technique of moulding minds, from the National-Socialist system, but that, of course, they would apply it in the service of a widely different *Weltanschauung*?

My own view is that Plato, regarding his philosopher-kings as possessing, *ex hypothesi*, the absolute truth, would hold that the absolute truth justifies dictatorial methods of maintaining and propagating it, and that nothing else does so. I would hope, however, that his absolute truth would be free from the excessively *nationalistic* temper of Fascism and National-Socialism, and free too from the *racial* temper of the latter. Whether Plato, in addition, would have held, reviewing the present state of Europe and comparing it with that of Athens broken by the Peloponnesian war, that there are crises in the lives of states when any faith is better than none; when any order is better than chaos; when any rule which restores unity, and the strength which comes with unity, is better than drifting and being at sixes and sevens; when any cause which offers to men the chance of escaping from selfishness and self-indulgence into the service of a supra-personal ideal is better than further demoralization—this is a question which I need not here attempt to answer.

But, all of us who still retain our faith in the value of individual freedom, and the corresponding "democratic" organization of society, will do well to learn the lessons of the challenge thrown out to us by the new dictatorships and their "ideologies." These lessons seem to me to be at least three. First, our own faith in democracy must be militant, not only in words, but in deeds. We must guard against the acknowledged defects with which human nature afflicts the practice of democratic principles. We must make democracy *work* more successfully than it has often worked in the past. And this requires more public spirit in all of us; more readiness to subordinate

private to public good, than easygoing democratic ways usually exact from us. Secondly, we must realize that a democracy which cannot, through free institutions, control the economic order of society in the cause of justice between classes and races, at least as well as this or that dictatorship attempts to do it, or professes to be doing it, has no claim to survive. And, thirdly, we must bear in mind that we have undertaken the most difficult enterprise which men living together in complex modern society can attempt, viz. to elicit unity of will and firmness of decision out of the varying and often conflicting interests and opinions of a large body of people. To do this by authoritarian methods, backed by organized force, is relatively easy: to do it by discussion and vote makes the greatest demands on men's resources of good sense and good will. If dictatorships come to prevail and democracy passes from the world, it will be, not because it is in principle an inferior method of government, but because human nature proved unequal to its demands

SOME MERITS AND DEFECTS OF CONTEMPORARY GERMAN ETHICS

(*Materiale Wertethik* in Scheler, Spranger, Nicolai Hartmann)

DR. PHIL. DAVID BAUMGARDT

(*Formerly Professor of Philosophy in the University of Berlin*)

To preach morals is easy, to ground them difficult. I think this saying of Schopenhauer is quite true. In the writings of the moral theorists we meet with ample enthusiasm for the beauty and the loftiness of moral principles. But even the best moral sermons are certainly no substitute for philosophical reasoning. To-day more than ever before we need the soundest foundation for a truly fixed ethics. For, to-day there is not a single affirmation in morals, which is not contradicted by its opposite. Eduard von Hartmann, for instance, could in the beginning of the twentieth century still maintain that the differences of opinion in ethics are concerned with questions of general principle, rather than with the concrete application of these principles. But Edward Westermarck in the strictest contrast holds that the concrete moral customs differ radically amongst different nations, especially among the primitive peoples, and that agreement of opinion is found only as regards general principles.[1] Moreover, the whole of Christian ethics is to-day opposed as a slave morality, because its highest values are humility and love. And in extreme opposition to this a consistent Christianity is never compatible with the thoroughgoing master-morality, whose supreme value is sheer power.

[1] See E. von Hartmann: *System der Philosophie im Grundriss*, Bd. VI, *Grundriss der ethischen Prinzipienlehre*, 1909, p. v: "Die verschiedenen Systeme der Moral . . . zeigen . . . in ihren konkreten Detailausführungen mehr Ähnlichkeit miteinander . . . als die Verschiedenheit und Gegensätzlichkeit in ihren Prinzipien vermuten lässt." E. Westermarck: *The Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, 1924, vol. ii, p. 742: "The moral ideas of mankind . . . present radical differences. A mode of conduct which among one people is condemned as wrong is among other people viewed with indifference or regarded . . . as a duty . . . But at the same time . . . the general uniformity of human nature accounts for . . . similarities." Or see G. E. Moore: *Ethics*, 1912, p. 94: "If we look at the extraordinary differences that there have been and are between different races of mankind and in different stages of society in respect of the classes of actions" and "particular actions" "which have been regarded as right and wrong it is . . . scarcely possible to doubt that in some societies actions have been regarded with actual feelings of positive moral approval towards which many of us would feel the strongest disapproval."

Therefore I think it is to be welcomed that now new efforts are being made in English and German ethics to give moral philosophy a more fundamental basis. And the latest extensive movement in German thought which has this particular purpose in view is styled "materiale Wertethik," that is, concrete, material ethics of values. One of the leaders of that group of philosophers proclaimed that only this kind of ethics can solve the most difficult problems we meet in Kant and Nietzsche as well as all the profoundest ethical questions of ancient and modern times.[1] Can this ethics indeed make good such ambitions?

I propose to examine these contentions in at least a few points.

I. Max Scheler, promulgated this new ethical doctrine in 1913 and 1916 in the *Jahrbuch für Philosophie und phänomenologische Forschung*, in a treatise of considerable length entitled "Der Formalismus in der Ethik und die materiale Wertethik." But it would lead too far afield to analyse the more subtle distinctions between the *strict* phenomenology of Husserl, the master of Scheler, and Scheler's own thought. For the analysis and critique of the ethics of Scheler it is indeed more necessary to consider first the very revealing contrast between this new moral philosophy and that of Kant. For Scheler himself has explained his doctrine in its widest aspects as in opposition to Kant's *Critique of Practical Reason*. The subtitle of the first and most important part of his essay reads: "With special reference to Kant's ethics," and again the term "Formalism" in the very title of his essay designates just the "colossus" of "Kant's moral philosophy."

It is interesting to observe that the first reaction against positivism and against all forms of hedonism in ethics was both in England and in Germany in the nineteenth century a return to Kant. Thomas Hill Green in England and precisely at the same time Hermann Cohen in Germany, found salvation from positivistic ethics primarily in the direction of Kantian philosophy. For ethical positivism or utilitarianism put in place of universal imperatives of ethics empirical observation, namely that all men strive for shifting forms of pleasure, whilst the deepest and the most important tendency of Kant is to show that there is one absolutely universal ethical law, valid without any reference to empirical, changing feelings. The utilitarians hold that ethical values are *a posteriori* only: that is, that ethical values differ entirely with the different inclinations of persons and at different epochs. But Kant in the sharpest opposition to such a view wanted to stabilize ethical right as strictly *a priori*. Here lies—in its most general historical connection—the point of contact between Scheler and Kant. Scheler agrees with Kant that the ethically valuable can only be given for us *a priori*, not *a*

[1] N. Hartmann: *Ethics* (translated by Stanton Coit), 1932, vol. i, p. 17.

posteriori by empirical altering occurrences. And Scheler further agrees with Kant and with Neo-Kantianism that knowledge *a priori* is not an inborn, innate knowledge, to be found in us earlier than all other experiences. The *a priori* is not prior in time, but precedent in logical significance. For instance, if we contemplate the famous syllogism: because all men are mortal, therefore also the man Socrates is mortal, we have not at first an event that all men die and then the event that Socrates dies; but that all men are mortal is only a reason which logically precedes the death of Socrates. And it is only in this logical sense that Scheler and Neo-Kantianism use the word *a priori*. A value *a priori* is therefore not a value we know already at our birth before we know other things; but a value *a priori* is a value which can never be depreciated, which can never become valueless by any new experience. Thus, both Scheler and Kant seek after absolutely firm ethical principles of this kind, for ethical principles *a priori*, which show a self-evident value, comprehensible in themselves. And such an ethical law Kant found only in one quite abstract, formal principle, namely in his categorical imperative in contrast to all hypothetical laws.

Now, Scheler considers that Kant erred therein. We are not compelled to accept such a purely formal and abstract law as the only fixed rule in morals. We are also able to find concrete material values *a priori*. Kant was only justified in rejecting *concrete goods* or concrete *ends* in *a priori* ethics. However, in contrast to these concrete empirical goods or ends, there are still concrete values *a priori* which Kant failed to recognize as such. For example: A good lunch is surely a good. And it is certainly a moral end to offer such goods to others. But not always. To a sick person such a good might be a serious evil: for him a bitter-tasting medicine would be a good. Goods, accordingly, can never have an unchanging value in our moral actions. But also concrete ends without concrete goods can never reach the level of an absolutely invariable principle. To give some goods to others—although it must remain uncertain as to which goods in particular—even this end is not always a moral one; for, it is sometimes better not to give anything to a friend neither a lunch nor medicine nor any other goods, but to let him fast. Thus neither concrete goods nor concrete ends can be referred to strictly universal ethical principles. An entirely different conception is here called for, namely the conception of concrete values. The goods we had to give to our neighbour may vary; and even the whole end, the whole purpose to give anything may be wrong from the moral point of view. Only one conception has been ever present, and only this conception has rightly guided us in these elementary reflections, namely the idea of the well-being of our friend, the value of the life of our fellow-man. This vital value

remained the same. The different goods may some day lose their moral meaning, and may even become evil; and also all the different ends and concrete aims; there remains unchanged and unchanging a distinct number of concrete values.

These values retain an absolutely eternal moral significance, and they fall into four groups: (1) the values of the agreeable and useful; (2) the values of vitality; (3) intellectual values, by which are meant the values of truth, beauty and justice; (4) the religious values, the values of the holy. Nobody can deny—as Scheler explains—that the useful, for instance, is necessarily of moral value for all people and at all times. The goods which are useful are often very different for different men and in different ages. And also the ways and means and goals, by which we want to bring the useful into existence. But the value of the agreeable itself remains throughout the same; it can never be changed to a non-value.

And Scheler has also given some explanations of why the importance of these concrete values has always hitherto been overlooked. Thus he has explained that a man who is really helpful does not help because he wants to realize some vital value in the life of his friend. On the contrary, his intention is to do some *concrete* work for his friend. If a man only does good works, not because he wants to help, but because he wants to be moral, then his work is in truth not purely moral. On the contrary, it would be pharisaism in the bad sense, in which this phrase is in general used, if we never helped for the sake of helping, but only did it to realize moral values. Thus in the specifically ethical acts we do not directly have moral values in view; and these values do not appear in the ends at which the acts aim. The moral values appear, as Scheler says, only "on the back" of our acts.[1] Therefore we can understand why the philosophers have never analysed these concealed values, which are in general never the express ends of our acts. But these values are never to be identified with any ordinary end or any real good or any real thing of value.

These values are pure essences, *Wesenheiten, essentiae.* They have a purely ideal existence. But none the less this ideal existence is for us at least as important as the existence of real things or events. And we have an immediate insight *a priori*, into what is the meaning of such ideal essences as vital or intellectual value. There is in us an *ordre du cœur* or *logique du cœur*, as Pascal has called it.[2] In this emotional order we have an immediate "sensing

[1] M. Scheler: *Der Formalismus in der Ethik und die materiale Wertethik*, II, Aufl. 1921, p. 22; compare N. Hartmann, *Ethics*, 1932, vol. ii, p. 31.

[2] *Ibid.*, 1921, p. 59; compare N. Hartmann, *Ethics*, 1932, vol. i, p. 177.

of value,"[1] a quite evident inner vision, a clear "beholding"[1] of what these pure ideas mean. These ideas of values are not given us in the form of rational conceptions; but nevertheless we have of them a concrete, not formal perception *a priori.*

Moreover Scheler is even convinced, that we are able to recognize *a priori* a definitely strict gradation in the scale of these values. We discern always at once that the value of the holy is higher than all aesthetical, all intellectual values and much higher than the vital values or the values of the agreeable. And so we find finally in Scheler's Ethics—perhaps as the most important result—the following scale of values: the lowest value is the value of the agreeable. The type of person who is only realizing this value, the artists of pleasure, never reach such a high moral level as the heroes, the men who build up the best form of vital value. And the vital value of the noble in its contrast to the common, the quality of this heroism, has always a higher moral importance than the merely agreeable and useful. The third place in this scale is occupied by the intellectual values of truth, beauty, and justice. The type of person who realizes these values, the genius, stands again morally higher than the hero and than the artist of pleasure and usefulness. And a community of culture and law is higher than a community solely of "life" or than a society of business men. But at the top of the scale of values remains the value of the sacred. All that which is connected with this religious value stands also in Ethics in the supreme place: the religious "reaction of response" as belief or adoration always stands higher than esteem or respect in the intellectual field or than the feeling of courage in the vital sphere. The religious state of blessedness always weighs ethically heavier than intellectual delight or vital gladness or agreeableness in the sphere of the useful. Scheler emphasizes continually the fact that people very often take extremely unholy things for holy and very unintellectual thoughts for intellectual. But nevertheless, the value of the holy in itself remains absolutely constant as does also the superior rank of the holy in comparison with the intellectual, the vital, and the useful objects.

In this way Scheler hoped to solve the oldest difficulties of Ethics; and therefore it is not astonishing that these and similar fundamental ideas of his have exercised a very large influence in Germany not only in Ethics, but also in Sociology, Pedagogy, and even in Psychology; and also in Spain on Ortega y Gasset, in Japan, or in South Africa on H. G. Stocker, a pupil of Scheler.

II. More especially Eduard Spranger in one chapter of his *Lebensformen* (1921), has given to several theses of Scheler some

[1] See these terms especially in N. Hartmann: *Ethics*, 1932, for instance, vol. i, p. 185.

development and some corrections of very wide-reaching effect. Spranger distinguishes six different types of carriers of values: the economic man, the theoretical man, the aesthetic man, the social man, the man of power, and the religious man. Thus the sphere of intellectual value mentioned by Scheler is here quite rightly divided into the very different forms of theoretical and aesthetic values. And what is much more important, it is here also well brought out, that in the vital sphere and in the whole social order there is a deep difference between the manifestations of power and the manifestations of love. In this whole vital sphere of public life we find very often represented under the same name two distinctly contrasted ideals: the ideal of a life and of a community of social love and on the other hand of a community of specific political power. But besides that, for both Spranger and Scheler the highest value is the religious and the lowest in general the useful, here called the economic value. Only in regard to the scale of the other values Spranger is—I think again quite rightly—much more careful than Scheler. He attempts to eliminate the difficulty which he sees in so strict and simple a graduation of all values, namely that one of his six values has to be always the highest. He urges, therefore, in the problem of the rank of values that we are obliged to consider not only distinctions of higher and lower, but also distinctions of stronger and weaker values. Values are not only at a different height, but also often of different intensity, different force. For instance, according to an example of Spranger: the understanding of Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* can be for us a much higher value than the earning of money, but none the less we have often to prefer—even as ethical persons—a lower value, if this value can claim in the circumstances a much stronger intensity.[1] And therefore we have also to think in every moral decision not only of the height but also of the present strength of values.

III. Finally, we find quite a similar critical supplement of Scheler's teaching in the most extensive and latest German work about material ethics of values, in Nicolai Hartmann's *Ethics* (in the second German edition published 1935). Hartmann was in the first stage of his development a keen adherent of Hermann Cohen and Neo-Kantianism. It was only later on that he approached Phenomenology. And thus also Hartmann started by building up his whole theory expressly on the phenomenological foundations of Scheler. Hartmann rejects—as Scheler does—all Ethics of goods and ends; and like Scheler he begins by asserting that there are different ethical values as pure essences and that they possess an ideal existence—according to Hartmann even an absolute "self-

[1] E. Spranger: *Lebensformen*, 1930, p. 315.

existence,"[1] a definitely ontological independence. And only if we bring these ideal essences *a priori* with us to the observed objects are we able to speak of valuable facts *a posteriori*.[2] Further Hartmann agrees in general with Scheler's phrase, the values appear "on the back of the deed," not in the goal it aims at. But he then adds the correction: there are *some* moral actions in which we are able to strive directly for a moral value, for example in the case of moral education of oneself or another.[3] And it is clear that not everyone, who does something with the direct wish to realize a moral value, is therefore a pharisee in the bad sense in which Scheler uses the term.

Finally, however, in the most important and in the most difficult problem of Ethics, namely in the question of the number and of the gradation of values, there are in Hartmann as in Spranger some departures from Scheler, which are more serious. Hartmann here thinks it necessary to distinguish and to give broad descriptions of many more values even than those which Spranger describes. He therefore begins by giving an analysis of a group of fundamental values, which in his words "condition contents" (*inhaltlich bedingende Grundwerte*); they are life: consciousness, activity, but also suffering, which can often become a value, strength, foresight, and happiness. And there is a second realm, of fundamental moral values, which in contrast to the first are in a special relation to freedom: here we find the good in general, the noble in contrast to the common, the richness of experience and, in some contrast to this richness, purity. Hartmann then distinguishes three further classes of special higher concrete values. The first group comprises the four Platonic virtues, justice, wisdom, courage, self-control, supplemented by Aristotelian virtues of the golden mean such as magnificence, magnanimity, the sense of shame. The doctrine of Aristotle is here used in a very interesting although a rather disputable interpretation. The second group of special values presents the more Jewish and Christian virtues, such as brotherly love, trust and faith, modesty, humility, aloofness, and truthfulness, with the problem of the necessary lie. Finally the third realm of special values brings such more modern Nietzschean values as the love of the remotest (*die Fernstenliebe*) in contrast to brotherly love, "radiant virtue," that is in Nietzsche, *schenkende Tugend*, and, as highest special value, personal love.

But still more instructive than these detailed pictures of virtues is Hartmann's attitude towards the problem of the gradation of values. He does not assume that there is only one dimension of values from lower to higher, but he speaks explicitly of a multiple

[1] N. Hartmann: *Ethics*, 1932, vol. i, p. 225 et seq.
[2] *Ibid.*, vol. ii, p. 365 et seq.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 35.

dimensionality[1] of the whole valuational space,[2] and even of more than three dimensions.[3] Thus, for instance, Hartmann expressly develops the view that perpendicularly to the scale of grades or levels of values there exists in addition a relation of *co-ordination* among different values upon the same level. This means that the order of gradation is shown to be at the same time also differentiated "laterally."[4] Thus, for example, the value of richness of experience would according to this theory not be higher than humility but approximately co-ordinated.[5] With it we find also in Hartmann as in Spranger the values ordered not only according to their grade but also according to their intensity, or as it is here called according to their strength. Thus, for instance, the love of the remotest—that is the love for a higher type of man in the future—this "ethos of progress"[6] is the higher value and brotherly love is the lower one.[7] But nevertheless love for our fellow-man—near us in our life—remains always the more urgent, the stronger value. And besides all this, Hartmann frequently emphasizes the fact that in all ages man has been able to see only a small part of the whole of this "firmament of values." And even in this small section of the whole "heaven of values," which we know, we are, according to Hartmann, not able to recognize in *every* case which value is to be preferred in certain complicated moral conflicts. We have to be content for the present, that we can decide quite clearly that brotherly love is, *a priori*, evidently higher than justice, bravery higher than self-control, faith and fidelity higher than bravery and "radiant virtue," or personality again higher than fidelity.[8] But obviously in all these decisive questions of ethics we find here again in Hartmann much more caution and resignation than in his predecessor Scheler.

IV. These are some main motives of this concrete Ethics of values. And certainly we must do justice to the very careful and extensive descriptions of moral phenomena we find in these three authors. Not only in such analyses as those I have glanced at, but also in many discussions of Scheler and Hartmann about the conception of personality, in many analyses of the structure of ethical acts and intentions in Spranger's ideas of a *geisteswissenschaftliche Psychologie* and its significance for Ethics or in Hartmann's long analysis of freedom obvious merits are displayed. But I think that in many other points these theories still remain unsatisfactory.

Thus in the first place this material *a priori* does *not*, as Scheler hoped, succeed in avoiding the defects of the formal *a priori* of Kant. It is true that the pure formal *a priori* of Kant is applicable only to a very small realm of ethical problems, whilst the new material

[1] N. Hartmann: *Ethics*, 1932, vol. ii, pp. 50, 51. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 78.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 408. [4] *Ibid.*, pp. 50, 51. [5] *Ibid.*, p. 387.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 319. [7] *Ibid.*, p. 387. [8] *Ibid.*, p. 387.

a priori of the latest German ethics concerns a much wider field. But nevertheless—as we could observe already in the results of Spranger and Hartmann—this new material *a priori* has no longer the same *universal* validity as the Kantian formal *a priori*. It can never be legitimate to call the concrete values in the same sense *a priori* as a purely formal ethical law.[1] Hartmann even confesses that all theoretical and moral *a priori* has something "puzzling"[2]; yet such an *a priori* has surely nothing any longer in common with Kant's theoretical *a priori*.

But further—and that leads to points of much more importance—evidently it has to be one of the most serious ambitions of all ethics, and it was also the aspiration of Kantian ethics not to move within the circle of purely analytical judgments, that is to say, in the circle of empty tautologies or pure definitions independent of all real facts. Kant placed in the centre of his whole system the rule that the cardinal questions of philosophy have to be expressed in synthetic judgments, that is in judgments in some way concerning reality; and that these synthetic cognitions should be kept from any confusion with purely analytic deductions. Also in his ethics Kant tried at least to face everywhere the synthetic significance of the cardinal problems of morality and to answer them by synthetic judgments, although here he did not succeed. But Nicolai Hartmann renounces deliberately any attempt at dealing with such most important synthetic difficulties inasmuch as he points out that "we must entirely leave out of consideration what has been understood by the 'doctrine of virtue'; to such a doctrine belongs not only a description of the virtues, but even instruction as to their actualisation. Instruction of this kind . . . everyone of morally fine discrimination has always dismissed . . . as a trifling with what is highest and most serious, as that which degraded even the words 'moral' and 'virtue' into something tiresome and half ridiculous. . . . The moral values themselves permit of being simply pointed out within the limits of the current valuational vision without reference to their practical tendencies."[3] But here obviously two different questions are to be distinguished. Of course, the question of how to become a good man through instruction and practical exercise is not a problem of any scientific and theoretical ethics. But this question of moral exercise is not to be confounded with quite another one, namely the purely theoretical question, why have certain moral synthetic valuations *a priori* validity for empirical actions? N. Hartmann has here, as it seems, tacitly identified the first with

[1] See D. Baumgardt: *Der Kampf um den Lebenssinn unter den Vorläufern der modernen Ethik*, 1933, p. 59 *et seq.*, where I have tried to clear up these questions in as full detail as possible.

[2] N. Hartmann: *Ethics*, 1932, vol. ii, p. 276.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 226.

the second problem; and because the first one is to be excluded from a purely theoretical science of ethics, he and Scheler underestimated also the significance of the latter problem for theoretical ethics.

If we wish to illustrate the meaning of these ethical inquiries by comparing them with some corresponding questions in the theory of nature, we could do so for instance in the following general form: it is a purely theoretical question to ask, why have some laws of nature (for instance the law of causality, but also more special laws) validity in empirical processes of nature? This problem is strictly to be discriminated from all practical questions of so-called technics: how to use causal natural processes to satisfy the various desires of human civilization. By eliminating the questions of technics evidently no philosopher or physicist can be allowed to neglect the first main problem, the inquiries concerning the validity of laws of nature for empirical natural phenomena.

But finally these first major problems are still very often confused with questions of a third kind. This third form of research is specifically concerned with the "description" and definition of laws and of conceptions *a priori*. And these investigations were primarily cultivated in *a priori* metaphysics before Kant and Hume. Here we find frequently the quite conscious identification of such analytic definitions and descriptions *a priori* with our first synthetic problems. For instance, here in this metaphysics *a priori* we find the following basic conviction: by the purely analytic definition, by the pure essence of the conception of "cause" the synthetic conception also of causality, it is maintained, is already proved as valid for the reality. Kant and Hume fought against this confusion very convincingly. But in modern concrete ethics of values the corresponding confusion is even to-day not sufficiently faced; or it is wrongly denied that there is any confusion, as that was denied in the metaphysics *a priori* of the seventeenth century.

Hartmann, of course, concedes expressly that in theoretical knowledge "the proof of 'objective validity' for categories *a priori* (in their relation to *a posteriori* objects) is of most fundamental importance."[1] But concerning the corresponding problem in ethics he prefers to content himself occasionally with the statement: the proof of the objective validity of values "is not to be found in any agreement with the real."[2] "Non-agreement with the empirically given" (or the "actual") is no criterion which could be cited against the validity of valuations."[3] But here again, as before, the term "the actual" covers quite different problems. It is naturally to be admitted, that we do not need in moral questions an agreement

[1] N. Hartmann: *Ethics*, 1932, vol. i, p. 190.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 191. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 192.

between values and empirical conduct which is already actualized, because ethics deals to a large extent with actions which have perhaps never been realized but could be realized in future. Yet this definitely does not mean that in the description of any concrete value we could be allowed to renounce all agreement with *realizable possible* empirical conduct. If thus much is to be renounced, then we shall not be able to avoid at least the following dilemma: either we then have no guarantee that our values are not fantastic ideals which are even perhaps contradictory in themselves;[1] or we remain in the description of our concrete values *a priori* in the sphere of purely analytic judgments and we find then in these conceptions *a priori* only what we have slipped into them already in our definitions. But then neither the basis of our valuations nor the empirical conduct of man remains morally understood.[2]

Or: the insufficiencies we have to notice in these ethics of concrete values could be elucidated in connection with some other historical and systematic motives. This system of ethics itself has designated its conceptions of values as Platonic ideas;[3] but Plato himself always insisted upon the necessity of clearing up the problems of the μεθεξις of ideas *a priori* in the empirical facts and the necessity of demonstrating their validity for those facts. Therefore it is certainly unsatisfactory, when for instance N. Hartmann wants here essentially to restrict himself to the pure descriptions of the values *a priori* "without reference . . . to their actualization," without any "agreement with the real."

Of course no ethics has the task of dealing with every detail of casuistry. Similarly the natural sciences are not able to discuss in their theories every individual natural phenomenon. But they give us at least a much clearer insight into the inter-relations of reality and ideal laws than any modern ethics hitherto. All the questions of most interest here carry beyond the researches of Scheler and Hartmann.

We may agree with these theories that the love of the remotest is higher than brotherly love. And certainly, as Hartmann declared, honour is morally more valuable than advantage and duty more than pleasure,[4] according to the definitions of these values. But all these are analytic judgments; and the characteristic marks

[1] And such fantastic ideals, moreover all that "contradicts . . . conditions of actualization," every "ethically fabulous world" are quite rightly rejected by Hartmann (see *Ethics*, vol. ii, p. 324).

[2] See some further systematic researches on these problems of connection between ethical *a priori* and ethical *a posteriori* in my essay, "Über einige Hauptmethodenfragen der modernen Ethik," *Logos*, 1930, and especially in a larger book prepared (as the last systematic volume of my history of modern ethics) under the title *Theory of the Meaning of Life or Ethics*.

[3] N. Hartmann: *Ethics*, 1932, vol. i, p. 185. [4] *Ibid.*, vol. ii, pp. 188 f.

developed in these descriptions *a priori* are absolutely insufficient to distinguish in reality even between a life of honour and a life for advantage. There are too many people and nations who are convinced that they fight for honour and who are able to persuade other people to the same belief. But their adversaries are on quite the same point convinced that the others fight for pure advantage masking itself as honour, or that they pursue pleasures masking themselves as duties, or that they avoid duties masking themselves as phantasms or as superfluities or even as crimes; and vice versa. And there are other people who confess honestly that they feel obliged to think in such a case of their advantage and who go perhaps in spite of this confession more the way of honour than the others with their much prouder declamations.

But obviously, then, the conclusion is here always necessary that we do not find in all these descriptions of values *a priori* any true distinguishing mark which separates the moral conduct from the immoral, honour from advantage, pleasure from duty and so on. And such definitions not containing any distinguishing mark are certainly scientifically not satisfactory definitions. Thus it is very characteristic that the most consistent idealism, namely that of Hegel, and the most consistent empiricist ethics, namely that of Bentham, agree entirely in this point of insisting that not the description of virtues but the cardinal problems of moral casuistry are the most serious moral problems.[1] The modern concrete ethics of values on the other hand as well as Kant only evade these questions in affirming that the mere striving for honour, for duty, for justice, or for other high values is valuable, even if there is no striving for true honour or true justice.[2] But evidently also this form of a pure ethics of intention cannot show here any way out. For I think especially to-day nobody can deny that with the best intentions, in the name of duty and justice and of many other values, the most immoral actions are done in the present time and have been done in the past. And it would be quite impossible to call such extremely

[1] See Hegel: *Werke*, 1838, Bd. I, p. 245: "Differenz des Fichteschen und Schellingschen Systems"; and see Bentham: *Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*, chap. x, § 30: "Would you do a real service to mankind, show them the cases in which sexual desire *merits* the name of lust; displeasure, that of cruelty; and pecuniary interest, that of avarice." But "those rhapsodies of commonplace morality, which consist in the taking of such names as lust, cruelty, and avarice, and branding them with marks of reprobation" are "empty." "Applied to the *thing* they are false; applied to the *name*, they are true indeed, but nugatory."

[2] N. Hartmann: *Ethics*, 1932, vol. ii, p. 233: "The will to justice is right even, when intention is objectively wrong, when the . . . law (in German, "Der Sachverhaltswert des Gesetzes") has been misunderstood—exactly as it is right independently of the consequence."

horrible deeds ethical, simply because the intention in them was a good one.

Therefore it is only too comprehensible that this concrete ethics of values tried to find yet other ways to escape such embarrassments. Thus, for instance, N. Hartmann wanted to give to this ethics of pure intention still another basis by the following time-worn reflection: if in certain phenomena, as for instance in resentment, "a gainsaying" of the character of values takes place, then there is here a "doing of violence" to the sense of value in question, an "habitual untruthfulness, manifested as a falsification in the evil conscience of the resentful man."[1] If our conscience could decide in so simple a manner about the moral value or the immorality of every action, we should in fact not need any further discussions about the synthetic actualization of values *a priori* and the question of consequences of actions in ethics. But obviously there have been in all times even very great men of great resentfulness with an astonishingly good conscience (as Nietzsche had already pointed out); and there are morally excellent men without resentment with a very bad conscience. Therefore all this ethics of pure intention and infallible conscience is in urgent need of correction by much deeper researches as well about deafness of conscience and "value-blindness" as about the consequences of ethical or immoral actions.

As a matter of fact also the concrete ethics of values speaks sometimes of the phenomena of value-blindness (*Wertblindheit*).[2] Here again, however, we may observe some shortcomings of this whole ethical theory in a specially concentrated form. Namely the phenomenon of value-blindness is here quite rightly compared with colour-blindness. But then it is only assumed that the problems of distinction between abnormal and normal vision of values is not more difficult than the problem of distinctions between normal sense of colour and colour-blindness. Yet here again just as in the comparison with some problems of natural science we are able to indicate the weaker side of this ethics. For, it is quite obvious, that we have objective physical criteria of the distinction of different colours, independently of the subjective normal or abnormal perceptions of them. But in the case of concrete values we have still to find such objective criteria. There certainly are such; yet the criteria found hitherto are far from being exact enough to decide in any concrete case. And this becomes evident in every application of these criteria in complicated questions. But even in the most simple cases the same difficulties are only hidden, not solved.

[1] N. Hartmann: *Ethics*, 1932, vol. ii, p. 60.

[2] N. Hartmann speaks even of "blindness to the rank of a value" (see *Ethics*, vol. ii, p. 189).

AN OUTLINE OF AN ORDER PHILOSOPHY

ARNOLD H. KAMIAT

I

THROUGHOUT the history of philosophy the concept of unity has presented a problem. What does it mean to say that the cosmos is one, that a thing is one, that an organism is one, that a nation is one, that mind and body are one, that knower and known are one? Exactly what is it that is denoted when unity is postulated of anything? And when two or more entities are conceived as subsisting in unity, exactly what is the relation between that unity on the one hand, and its correlative duality or plurality on the other?

At first glance, it would seem as if the difficulties associated with the concept of unity lay in its apparently undefinable character. But if the concept of unity has hitherto defied definition, if the unity of anything has seemed to be such a tenuous, gaseous, mystic affair, the fault may lie with the mode of approach. And those who have approached anything in the spirit of monism have traditionally held to a substantival notion of unity. Unity has been conceived as a substance, an essence, a spirit, a soul, an entelechy, an elan vital, a mind. It has been a mystic something that contained many things within itself and united them in a whole. On the macrocosmic level, the "unity" of the cosmos has been conceived as its spirit, mind, elan vital, or substance. Or the "unity" of the cosmos has been envisaged as a divine something called the One, perched on top of the universe, with everything in the universe an emanation from the One. Unity has thus been abstracted, substantialized, and hypostasized. And being so treated, it has been removed from out of the realm of the knowable. It thus shares the fate of all substance. In acquiring a stuff or an "inside," it acquires incomprehensibility, at least as far as reason and perception are concerned. The human knower occupies a point external to the noumenal substance; he cannot intellectually or perceptually penetrate to its "inside." This is the case even when he is himself an emanation or expression or mode or creation of the ultimate One; he stands at too great a remove from the One's innermost essence. Recourse is then had to faith, intuition, or mystic experience. This, however, is not too satisfactory an arrangement. Neither faith nor intuition nor the mystic experience yield anything that can be termed intrinsically valid. They are not self-validating. Faith cannot exercise a check

upon itself; neither can intuition, and neither can the mystic experience. All three are too naïve to be of much use as unaided instruments of cognition. Nor is the case much better from the side of extrinsic validation. The mystic experience is incommunicable. So is the intuition as such. The latter becomes articulate when it gets to be restated in terms of a proposition or a set of propositions. It can then be subjected to rational criticism. Similarly with the object of one's faith. When it becomes the subject of a proposition or a set of propositions, it can be placed under rational scrutiny. But then reason, being external to the noumenal substance, is judged to be helpless before it. Faith, moreover, is not really an instrument of cognition. It is an attitude of receptivity toward the content of a proposition. Faith reveals nothing concerning the proposition, or the existents, real or alleged, to which it refers. It reveals nothing more than a state of mind.

Some notion of the havoc produced by the substantival notion of unity is furnished by the history of theology. Theologians have been wont to conceive the deity as a simple, undifferentiated, immaterial principle or substance, without parts or attributes. But theologians have been equally insistent upon imputing to this same deity such attributes as omnipotence, eternity, omniscience, benevolence, creative activity, love, mercifulness, and so on. Recourse has therefore been had to some fancy juggling to reconcile absolute simplicity with a high degree of complexity. The same sort of juggling has been resorted to by the theologians who have striven to reconcile the idea of a divine absolute with that of a deity limited by his attributes. Matters would come to a head when the divine unity would be given such comprehensive dimensions as to include all existents of whatever character, including those of the most contradictory variety. Recourse would then be had to the formula of a divine being in whom all contradictions are somewhat reconciled; with this would go the "assurance" that human minds could apprehend the manner of this reconciliation if only they were equipped with the necessary powers.

Things have not gone much better with the philosophers. Metaphysics has been dominated by the substantival concept. Now every attempt at a substantival interpretation of the cosmos seems destined to find its way barred by insurmountable obstacles. The spiritual substance protagonists—those who posit an absolute, a transcendent mind, a cosmic soul, spirit, will, nisus, entelechy, or elan vital—have been unable to furnish an empirical warrant for their beliefs. Analysis of reality does not reveal the presence of any of these, nor, as will be seen, does a synthetic view of things require any of them. Their acceptance requires a large measure of faith; but faith, as has been seen, is not an instrument of cognition. And

if the spiritual cosmic substance be conceived as real, it must also be conceived as unknowable. No way exists for grasping or entering into it, perceptually or intellectually. Its "inside" lies outside of us. Nor are matters greatly improved when the insides of our minds are held to be expressions and likenesses of the cosmic spirit. No way exists of validating this view.

The materialist metaphysicians, in their turn, fare no better. The explanation of the universe in terms of matter being of the reduction-to-nothing-but type, materialism has experienced the utmost difficulty in accounting for the presence in the cosmos of life, mind, and value. The failure of materialism in this regard moves those who subscribe to the substantival tradition to reintroduce the spiritual substances into philosophical discourse: vital substance, elan vital, entelechy, soul, and so on. Materialism thus places thought in a dilemma where the choice seems to lie between inadequacy and mysticism.

Not the least of the evils wrought by the substantialist metaphysics has been the disrepute into which metaphysics itself has fallen. If the universe can be talked about only in terms of some ultimate, noumenal, transcendent substance, mind, spirit, or will, the nature or "inside" of which is itself inexplicable, then metaphysics is a self-defeating enterprise. And on at least three significant occasions, modern philosophy stood on the brink of a more comprehensive scepticism—and for each of these crises the substantialist viewpoint was responsible. The three occasions are represented by the names, Hume, Kant, and Vaihinger. Each of these philosophers was a child of the substantialist tradition. All three were impressed by the idea that the mind cannot penetrate into the substance, the "inside" of the perceived object. For Hume the mind cannot go beyond its impressions. For Kant phenomena are the boundaries of perception. Beyond them lie the noumena. These being substances, and the human mind occupying a locus external to them, they are unknowable. For Vaihinger concepts are fictions, they being unable to communicate the natures of the objects conceived. They cannot reproduce and communicate substance or process.

Now neither theology nor substantival metaphysics have been entirely in error. Guilty they have been of abstraction and a consequent one-sidedness. Substance and energy and mind have been abstracted from their correlative and never-absent patterns and organizations. Unity has been treated as if it were a pervasive and etherlike substance in which all things "lived and moved and had their being," or of which they were all emanations. But this is the awkward way in which the thought of the past has sought to lay hold of the fact of that which all reality exhibits—order. The thought of the past has not failed to apprehend the fact that this universe

exhibits cosmos in all its forms—order, structure, system, integration, pattern, organicity, coherence, regularity, law. It even termed its substantial deity order, law, principle, and so on. It almost stumbled on what appears to be a more adequate conception of unity. But it did not quite stumble, thanks to the substantialist tradition. The latter required that order be substantialized; further, the religious tradition required that it also be personified. Order had to be a substance and a person.

II

A philosophy that would come as near as possible to an adequate account of the character of reality must take note of the fact that reality is an order, or a congeries of orders. Existences of every kind seem to exhibit one kind of order or another. Nothing can be explained in terms of substance alone, or energy alone, or quality alone, or consciousness alone, or value alone. And nothing is explicable in terms of order alone. But energies, substances, qualities, conscious processes, and values are always disposed in certain definite ways. They always enter into certain sets of relations—into systems, structures, organizations, integrations.

Order may be set down as a category, a generic trait of existence. The known universe exhibits order throughout, though whether all that exists constitutes a single order is a moot question. But this much seems clear, the known universe is at least a congeries of orders of many kinds. Of monism and pluralism it may be said that each of them is in one sense useful, and in another misleading. Pluralism is useful in calling attention to the reality of particulars. It misleads when it treats them apart from the structures by which they are comprehended.

Monism, as has been seen, misleads when it posits a single, immanent, pervasive substance. It is useful in emphasizing the reality of unity. It misleads when it substantializes and hypostasizes unity. Unity is apparently neither a substance nor a fundamental subsisting under things. Any existent unity is a very concrete sort of affair, being a pattern or organization of energies, substances, qualities, conscious processes, and/or values.

An order philosophy makes possible a synthesis of monism and pluralism. In an order, unity and plurality are reconciled. The order is one, but its ordered elements are many. If all existences in all time and all space could be demonstrated to constitute a single system, cosmic monism and cosmic pluralism would become reconciled. But there is no sufficient evidence to prove that the congeries of systems of all kinds that enter into human experiences constitute a systematic whole.

Is order eternal? If not, and if it had a beginning, whence did it

come and how was it begotten? Has the universe an order-giver, and if it has, what is his purpose? Place these questions under the head of the apparently unanswerable interrogations of philosophy.

Suffice it to say that order seems to be ubiquitous and enduring. No spot in the sea of being seems to be without order. This is not to say that all being is one system; but the universe is at least a congeries of orders of many kinds. There is no evidence that being ever failed to exhibit order, and there is no sign that it ever will fail so to do.

To the question, how order was first imposed upon the primordial energies of the universe, a two-fold reply can be made. Firstly, if such an event did take place, the question of the how of it is probably an unanswerable one. Secondly, the question separates energies and their structural patterns, and is therefore not in the spirit of the order philosophy, which refuses to separate the inseparable. In terms of the order philosophy, reality consists of ordered existents of many kinds, and existents—energies, qualities, the elements of consciousness, relations, ideal elements—are never to be found without order. There appears to be no warrant for the assumption of a primordial dichotomy into a formless, chaotic matter on the one hand, and an ordering principle on the other. Nor, for that matter, is it clear that there is any warrant for the assumption of a realm of essences mediating between human minds and a chaotic material flux.

Evolution, however, seems to be a process of continuous contemporary creation. Evolution is a synthesis of innovation and persistence. The tendency that Spinoza noted in every entity to preserve itself is probably the tendency of every stable organization to become fixed and habitual. Every stable organization of elements of any kind tends to become an institution. An organization that owes its origin to properties intrinsic to its constitutive elements will tend to persist as long as these properties do. If organization imposes a division of labour upon the constituent elements a sustaining factor is found in the shape of their mutual dependence. Here organization itself becomes a stabilizing factor.

Evolution is also a reformation or dissolution of old, and a coming to birth of new organizations. The alteration or dissolution of an organization is a result, either of internal instability, or of an external pressure of some sort, or of the elimination or death of one or more of its constituent parts. New organizations are generated in response to properties intrinsic to the organizing elements. These elements need not, of course, be primary. They may themselves be systems or hierarchies of systems.

What accounts for new types of elements? How account for the appearance, at a certain stage of evolution, of the elements of

consciousness? How account for the appearance of material and vital elements? These questions, too, may very well be unanswerable. But there are elements of other kinds, the origin of which can be made the subject of investigation. Social, cultural, and value elements belong to this class.

III

An order philosophy makes possible a sensible conception of basicality. There are no words more badly abused than the terms *basic*, *ultimate*, and *fundamental*. The meaning of these terms usually suffers a perversion imposed by a segmental outlook. The result is a fallacy that may be termed the fallacy of abstraction and integration. Given the integration of mutually dependent entities, the fallacy operates by the selection of one of them as basic. Stress is placed upon the dependence of all the other related entities upon the selected segment; its dependence upon these same entities is either ignored or treated as of secondary significance. The favoured segment is regarded as integrated with all the other segments when it is a matter of delineating its influence upon them; it is treated as if it had an existence apart from its integrations when it is a question of the influence exerted upon it by the other entities. In other words, the lines of influence between the selected segment and all the other segments are given a one-way orientation.

The *isms* of philosophy, science, religion, and politics are constructed in just this fashion. The conflict between *isms* is usually a struggle between abstracted segments, each of which puts forward a claim to a preponderant position in the economy of the whole of which it is a part. Personal elements enter into the conflict when the champions of the several segments feel their social status to be bound up with the fate of their respective segments. In every conflict of *isms* the thought of the contestants suffers from a psychological as well as a logical handicap. Personal bias unites with the fallacy of abstraction and integration to lower the quality of thought.

What would constitute a true concept of the basicality of an entity? Any thing is basic with reference to whatever is dependent upon it. Any part of an entity is basic to the extent that it, the part, functions as fundament to any other part, or to the entity as a whole. This is an inclusive, as opposed to an exclusive conception of the basic. It precludes the dramatic discovery of some one of the many integrated parts of a complex entity as *the* basis thereof. This means less drama, but more science and philosophy.

If anything be constituted of ordered elements, then either these elements or their order can be said to be basic relatively to that which they constitute. This is simple and obvious, but the partisans of *isms* will have none of it. Yet it must be apparent that an interpre-

tation in terms of an integration and interplay of constituent elements is juster than one that conceals the dependence of some favoured element upon co-ordinate factors, while it over-emphasizes their dependence upon the element in question.

That which is interpreted in terms of its constituent elements and their order may itself be an element, set in a larger order. Its adequate explanation would then require a recognition of the basic function of that more comprehensive system.

There thus issues a conception of an organizational basicality. The structure of an entity becomes as basic to that entity as any or all of its constituent elements. And one of the fundaments on which anything that is itself a member of a more comprehensive system rests is that system itself.

This discussion of basicality brings to view one of the merits of an order philosophy, and that is this, that it makes for the total, as against the segmental or isolated view. The apprehension of an order requires that it be grasped as a unit. And the locus of an order is the total field in which the order is exhibited. Thought in terms of order is therefore fatal to the kind of abstraction that involves the explanation of an existent or a process without reference to the system of which it is a part. Organization comes to exercise a heuristic function. Understanding the part in terms of the whole comes to mean the comprehension of an existent or a process in terms of its comprehending system.

IV

The body-mind problem has constituted an exercise in substantival futility. Two substances, mind and matter, have been thought to be in juxtaposition, if not indeed in a more intimate unity of some sort. In some way quite inconceivable they interact. But how a solid, weighty substance like matter could act upon, or be acted upon, by an imponderable, "unsubstantial" substance like mind, no one can tell. Or their unity has been conceived as external to them both—their actions are parallel. But this only adds to the mystery. If parallelism is not interaction, then it is miracle. Leibnitz, Malebranche, and Geulincx come forward with doctrines such as occasionalism and pre-established harmony, thus increasing the number of substances to three, God being the third. This latter is invoked as the source of a magic potency that assures parallel action, and therefore individual history.

If one does not wish to burden oneself with three, or even with two substances in an attempt to solve the body-mind problem, one can turn monist. According to one's predilection, one chooses spirit or matter. If the choice falls on spirit, the body becomes an illusion; if it falls on matter, the mind becomes an epiphenomenon.

In either case, the monism is a counterfeit, and the irrepressible dualism breaks through. The body may be an illusion, but it is an illusion that no one can get rid of. One just has to accept the illusory body, to live as if it were a real thing. Nothing is done, and nothing is changed by terming it illusory.

If mind is an epiphenomenon, it is none the less real. Terming it epiphenomenal does not lessen its reality; it merely makes it seem less important. The materialist really evades the body-mind problem —mind is contemptuously classed as merely a by-product of an aura around material facts. Epiphenomenalism is an evaluation, not an explanation. It does not dispose of the dualist problem.

An order philosophy might offer, as a contribution to the body-mind problem, the hypothesis of the personality as an organization of elements subsisting on more than one level of being. A personality is a systemic totality, a structured being, exhibiting a certain degree of coherence, and sometimes a striving for a more thoroughgoing unity. The constituent elements themselves are familiar—cells, organs, thoughts, feelings, sentiments, emotions, impulsions, memories, images, percepts. These are united in lesser systems, called habits, complexes, behaviour patterns, cultural patterns— so that the personality presents an aspect of organizations within a containing organization—a system of systems.

It is not at all essential to conceive of the constituent elements of a personality as qualitatively alike. They need not all be material, and they need not all be mental. It is one of the characteristics of organization that it often unites entities that are qualitatively distinct. An organization is often a synthesis of quantitative monism and qualitative pluralism. A human society is a synthesis of material, mental, social, and cultural elements. An artistic product unites ideational, affective, and material elements. Union does not require a joining of like to like. And so, it is quite unnecessary to conceive the human personality as all material, or all mental, or all social. The personality is not organized matter, nor a mind with an illusion of body, nor a point in space at which social influences converge to create an individual out of nothing but themselves. But the personality is an organization of sub-organizations of material, mental, and cultural elements. This organization, the personality's general framework or pattern, is the enduring self that Hume so vainly sought to find. It is that which constitutes the character of a person. It is that which acts, and it is that in terms of which a person assimilates whatever he does assimilate—and what he can assimilate his organization will determine. The maintenance of this integrity is health. Disease is disintegration, partial or entire. Healing is re-integration. But health and healing require also that the personal organization shall enter as a constitutive element into

social relations and organizations of a character conducive to the integrated function of the personality.

What the organism seems to point to is the fact that the physical, the living, and the mental can subsist and function together in organization. How organization can bring this to pass is a question that is perhaps insoluble. But there is no doubt that it does.

V

How can an order philosophy resolve the epistemological problem? This problem has concerned itself with the dualism of knower and known—how can this dualism be overcome? How can knower and known enter into the intimate unity of knowledge?

What does the knower know? What is it that is known?

What is known is a structured, patterned reality. And knowledge is itself a type of structured reality. The knowledge-content, however, involves two kinds of order. There is an internal order, this being the organization and the coherence of the knowledge-content itself. This is the type of coherence that receives its most perfect expression in a ystem of philosophy. But it is not only the philosopher's knowledge that is organized. Everyone's knowledge exhibits a certain framework with reference to which every item of knowledge is oriented, and into which every new cognition is assimilated.

It is the reality of this internal organization of knowledge that the coherence theory of truth has succeeded in grasping. Now whatever other distinguishing marks a body of true ideas may have, coherence will have to be one of them. Coherence is one of the tests of truth.

Knowledge exhibits another type of order. This time it is one of an external sort. It is the order that unites the knower to the known. Knowledge apprehends and symbolizes the order exhibited by the universe and the things within it. The process is mediated on the psychological side by percepts, mnemonic images, concepts, and systems of concepts. Perception appears to be a process by which the pattern and structure of things and processes is more or less literally apprehended. This may lie beyond demonstration, but it is at least highly probable. In practice, everyone proceeds on the assumption that perception does just this. And if perception is accompanied by action, which is the rearrangement and creation of patterns, and the action results in the emergence of desired configurations, perception is held to have been accurate and adequate. Here both the correspondence and the consequence tests of truth receive their confirmation.

The concept is a universal. It comprehends all the particulars

that belong to a class by virtue of their possession of a common pattern. The concept symbolizes that pattern. The concept is a result, not of the summation of all the percepts of the members of a given class, but of the abstraction from all the members of a class of a recurrent pattern. While the pattern of any member of a class is itself a particular, the pattern common to all the members of a class is, thanks to its generality, a universal.

The definition of knowledge as the apprehension of structure and configuration renders unnecessary and superfluous the conception of truth as useful fiction. As long as reality is conceived as either a substance with a mysterious and impenetrable "inside," or a restless, chaotic, elusive flux—so changeable that the mind cannot dip twice into the same universe—some sort of a plausible argument can be made out for the fictive doctrine. Truth can then be defined as a system of myths that make the world appear as if it possessed a knowable and manipulative order, and which thereby render possible the acquisition of a degree of control over that world. I do not know whether any champion of the fictive doctrine has ever explained how a mythical representation of a chaos as order can ever operate to render it controllable. A controllable chaos must possess regular and constant features, in which case it is not chaos any longer, but structure. Nor do I know whether any defender of the doctrine under consideration has explained how one portion of the crazy flux can impose any degree of control over any other portion, as man is said to impose a control over nature.

Be that as it may, an order philosophy renders superfluous the magic doctrine of fiction-truth. The order philosophy conceives reality as neither an impenetrable substance, an irrational surd, or a hopelessly wild maelstrom. Reality is a congeries of patterns and systems. Patterns and systems are cognizable. They can be perceived, envisaged, traced, manipulated. Where the strength of men is adequate to the task, patterns and systems can be reproduced, controlled, created. The commerce between man and the rest of reality is therefore intimate and direct, requiring no magic intervention of a middle realm of myths, essences, or fictions.

VI

What can an order philosophy say about values? The realm of value is the realm of ideal order. This is the same as saying that the world of values is the world of conation, for to purpose is to entertain an ideal scheme, and to attempt to execute a purpose is to endeavour to impose an ideal order upon a situation that is in some way unsatisfactory or incomplete. Hence that is valuable which creates, sustains, or exhibits an order desirable to some one. Value is therefore

a function of the relation between a person and an ideal order, sought for or attained. This is not a hedonistic conception of value. It does not locate value in the mere satisfaction of wants, however refined. In order that there be an experience of value, it is required that there shall be an ideal order in process of creation, materialization, or appreciation. Hence value is neither in the object—ideal order—solely, nor solely in the subject. It is a function of a relation between both. It requires both, and in a certain relation to each other.

Logical, aesthetic, and ethical values respectively make for or exhibit truth, beauty, and goodness. These three always involve a reference to certain types of ideal order. The ideal order connoted by truth has to do with the relation between ideas, and between ideas and the objects they have reference to. A proposition or system of propositions is true when it apprehends and symbolizes the structure and pattern of that to which it refers. A system of propositions that succeeds in doing this will also reveal an internal consistency. A system of propositions is also true if its grasp of a configuration of things is such as to facilitate its reshaping to suit the demands of an ideal order. The truth of a system of propositions thus involves an internal and an external order: the order of terms and propositions within the system, and the orderly relation to the set of external objects to which the system has reference.

In every work of art, some experience that possesses significance for the artist receives formal expression. The latter is essential if the experience in question is to acquire communicability and permanence. If the form is not achieved, the experience, however intense, remains nothing more than a formless and fleeting blotch in the history of the experiencer. Form is implicated in the very notion of expression, for to be expressed is to receive definiteness in some degree. The expression is artistic if it is able in some degree to reproduce in others the artist's experience. This reproduction will require the imposition of appropriate patterns upon material media. If the pattern functions not only to communicate the artist's experience, but also to satisfy the appreciator's sense for form, it is termed beautiful. Beauty is not completely definable; but the kind of patterning denominated by such terms as rhythm, symmetry, balance, harmony, seems to be a necessary condition of beauty. Beauty seems to be a function of the relation between a form so qualified and its appreciator.

What can an order philosophy say about goodness? An order philosophy views human beings and societies as structured entities. Every personality and every society is an organization of elements of many kinds. Every person and every society shares the tendency of all things to maintain its integrity. The good for the individual consists in the maturation of the several elements of the personality,

the acquisition and maintenance of an integration of these elements, the activity of the whole ordered self, and the enjoyment of this activity. The good for society consists in the growth, the free activity, and the integration into one comprehensive order of the varied elements that enter into its composition.

Thus the good is dependent upon the sustained existence of certain kinds of order. There must be ordered personalities, ordered societies, ordered physical environments. Those types of order are useful which aid in the achievement of what has just been defined as individual and social good. It is not, however, necessary to debate any such question as whether it is the individual or social good which is prior. The two are inseparable. The question, does the individual exist for society, or vice versa, is contrary to the spirit of the order philosophy. There do not exist two separate entities called society and individual, such that the good of the one requires the absence or the diminution of good in the other. A society is its individuals organized in a certain way, and the goodness of the one is continuous with the goodness of the other. A society is good if its individuals are. A society exhibits order to the extent that its individuals possess integrated personalities, personalities integrated internally and well-adjusted externally.

The history of all persons and that of all societies exhibit, nevertheless, only a partial integration. Conflict—the internal conflict of a personality, the external conflict of person with person, the conflict among societies and between groups within a society—is a universal phenomenon. Its correlative phenomenon is exploitation of human by human—a kind of anthropophagy, since it involves an effort to achieve the maturation of an individual or group at the expense of the maturity, and perhaps the life, of another individual or group. In the history of humanity, conflict and exploitation have made possible the growth of some societies and some individuals. Conflict and exploitation have thus been the necessary condition for the growth of these individuals and societies. But conflict and exploitation are never able to effect a pure integration. They are very much more effectual as disorganizing factors. And it is not only the defeated and the exploited whose integration is thwarted, and who experience disintegration. The victor and the exploiter, in their turn, suffer from thwarted maturation, a limitation of the degree of personal and social integration, and eventual personal and social disintegration, partial or entire. Conflict is katathymic in character. The fears, hatreds, and anxieties that it generates are physiologically, psychologically, and socially disintegrative, in the victorious as well as in the defeated society or individual. Exploitation is, of course, destructive of the exploited, but it turns back destructively upon the exploiter in at least three ways. First, energy

that might have been expended on the integrative ordering of the self is diverted to the subjection of the exploited. Second, exploitation is katathymic for exploiter as well as exploited. In both, fear and hatred give birth to a paranoid mentality. Third, in subjecting human beings to exploitation, the exploiter deprives himself of a necessary condition of his own completer growth and maturation: intercourse with matured and well-integrated personalities.

The problem of modern life is that of the displacement of katathymic conflict and exploitation by instrumentalities capable of effecting a purer and more widely distributed integration, personal and social. It is impossible entirely to avoid destructive conflicts, those internal to society as well as those internal to the individual. But conflicts can to some extent be eliminated and assuaged by the reorganization of life among democratic lines, democracy being defined as an order in which human groups and individuals are related in such fashion that the maturation, integrity, and abundant function of each depends upon, and contributes to, the maturation, integrity, and abundant function of the others.

PHILOSOPHICAL SURVEY

PHILOSOPHY IN ITALY

In 1920 Bignone published an Italian translation of the writings and fragments of Epicurus in Laterza's library of Ancient and Mediaeval Philosophers which in many respects added to and improved upon Usener's classic collection of *Epicurea*. He has since then zealously prosecuted these studies, and arrived at some very interesting conclusions which he has given out in two volumes published lately.[1] His starting-point is the observation that the writings of Epicurus often have a polemical tone, and not only rebut the accusations of adversaries who misinterpret the new doctrine, but are often directed also against those preceding philosophers who denied to pleasure a stable and certain nature on which a system of ethics could be based. Bignone has set himself the task of particularizing these anonymous predecessors, and thereby bringing the Epicurean polemic into more striking relief. It was easy and safe to start from the standpoint that Epicurus in his rehabilitation of pleasure had to oppose Plato and the Platonists, but at what Platonists in particular did he take aim? In answering this question Bignone has been able to make use of recent Aristotelian studies, especially those of Jaeger, which have thrown much light on the first phase of the Stagirite's philosophy, of a purely Platonic inspiration. As is well known, some exoteric dialogues belong to this phase, such as the *Eudemos*, the *Protrepticon*, and *On Philosophy*, which have to a large extent disappeared, though it has been found possible to reconstruct a few scattered fragments of them. The great scholastic works which reveal the full independence and maturity of Aristotle's genius have eclipsed them in the memory of posterity. But originally there were only these dialogues, the only ones published, to make Aristotle's thought known to the public outside the peripatetic school. The scholastic writings on the other hand remained unknown until the time of Sulla. What wonder, then, if Epicurus, in combating Platonism, had in mind these dialogues, which give out the fundamental conceptions of Platonism in a more decisive and dogmatic form than that of the Platonic dialogues?

This was the starting-point for Bignone's researches. In the carrying out of his plan he has discovered or rediscovered an enormous mass of evidential material, and he has been able to use it ingeniously in a two-fold fashion, making use of the references of Epicurus and the Epicureans to add to our knowledge of the lost writings of Aristotle, and utilizing this knowledge in order to bring into sharper focus the fragments and testimonies relating to Epicurus. Thus his studies end by bringing to light a greater knowledge of both Aristotle and Epicurus.

It is clearly impossible to summarize in a few lines the contents of more than a thousand pages of laborious and learned investigations. This notice is only intended to be a recommendation to the reading of the work itself, which, from a formal point of view, is an excellent example of accurate and patient philological criticism, and, from the point of view of results, allows us to visualize with greater amplitude and colour a historical era of transition

[1] Ettore Bignone: *L'Aristotele perduto e la formazione filosofica di Epicuro* (La Nuova Italia editrice, Firenze, 1936, 2 vols., pp. xvii, 410, 633).

between classicism and hellenism. In addition, it affords us the minor advantages of seeing many passages which formerly seemed obscure in commentators and critics cleared up in the light of the conflict of ideas between the philosophical schools as revealed by Bignone. It is opportune to add, however, that in so great a harvest of rediscoveries and reinterpretations not everything is pure gold. It happens sometimes to Bignone, as to every discoverer, to explain too many things in the light of his discovery, forcing the sense of some text, and in particular making the lost Aristotle the perpetual target of all the arrows of the Epicurean polemic, while in some cases it would be simpler and more natural to admit that they were directed against the Platonic Academy in general or even against some Academic philosopher nearer to Epicurus whose works have equally been lost.

The relationship between Bacon and Machiavelli, evidenced by frequent quotations from the latter in the works of the former, has not escaped the attention of historians, even in the past. But now for the first time it has formed the subject of a separate study by N. Orsini,[1] who, besides carefully scrutinizing the Baconian citations, seeks also to trace an ideal derivation of Bacon's practical philosophy from that of the Florentine secretary. Orsini's work is therefore of less interest to students as an investigation into origins than as an attempt at a genetic reconstruction of the Baconian ethics—that is, of that part of the system which is generally neglected by historians.

There is a famous passage in the *Advancement of Learning* in which Bacon affirms "that we are much beholden to Machiavel and others, that write what men do and not what they ought to do. For it is not possible to join serpentine wisdom with the columbine innocency, except men know exactly all the conditions of the serpent." This passage reveals clearly enough in what sense and within what limits Bacon is disposed to accept the realism of the Italian politician—not as the total expression of human nature, but as a shrewd characterization of an elementary and fundamental aspect of it, from which it is not possible to separate the other aspect (the columbine innocence) in which morality properly consists.

However, it often falls to Bacon, as a politician, to lay excessive emphasis on the former aspect in comparison with the latter, and consequently to concede to Machiavelli more than he would be disposed to grant him in the matter of principle. Thus the *Faber Fortunae* and the *Essays* are all compounded of pure Machiavellism, and Machiavellian also is the advice that Bacon, in his ministerial capacity, gave to Queen Elizabeth with regard to the policy to be followed towards the Catholics. He suggested to the Queen that if she wished to leave them powerful she should make them more satisfied, and if she wished to leave them discontented she should make them weaker, while the worst course to follow would be to make them powerful and dissatisfied. But apart from all this Machiavellism in detail, Bacon's whole conception of politics is of purely Machiavellian inspiration, comprising as it does the military view of the state and of virtue, the policy of expansion and naturalization, the idea of bringing governments back to first principles in order to strengthen and maintain them, and other similar maxims.

There is, however, in Bacon the other aspect of the practical problem. The individual is not only himself, hence he ought not to seek only *bonum suitatis*; but he is also part of a whole to which he is subordinated. Consequently *bonum comunionis* is superior to *bonum suitatis*. But how are egoism and morality to be reconciled in a single view of life? Orsini devotes the whole of the second part of his essay to this problem, and perhaps shows himself disposed to attribute to Bacon a much clearer awareness of the

[1] Napoleone Orsini: *Bacone e Machiavelli* (E. degli Orfieri, Genova, 1936, pp. 209).

distinction and agreement between the two sides than he had in reality. It does not seem to me that the passages he quotes go beyond an empiric eclecticism, still unaware of the conflicts latent between the two forces, which may be concealed under an apparent reconciliation. Bacon's view is certainly interesting that "the referring all to a man's self is more tolerable in a sovereign prince, because themselves are not only themselves, but their good and evil is at the peril of their public fortune." But here Bacon is reasoning as a politician, and the common good he has in mind has no moral value, although it has an utilitarian value. On the other hand, when he reasons as a philosopher and not as a politician, the formula at which he arrives is neither more nor better than a compromise: "Divide with reason between self-love and society, and be so true to thyself as thou be non false to others, specially to the king and country."

On these and other similar fragments it is not possible to base a distinction and a speculative agreement between egoism and morality. And it is not to be wondered at that it is not possible; it is enough to consider that all the rich flowering of English "moralism" of the eighteenth century, from Shaftesbury to the elaborators of the ideas of their predecessors, has not in this respect gone beyond the Baconian compromise. The fact is that the deeper problem which lay concealed under the facile agreement was still very immature and premature.

GUIDO DE RUGGIERO.

(*Translated from the Italian by Constance M. Allen.*)

NEW BOOKS

Examination of McTaggart's Philosophy, Vol. II. By C. D. Broad, Litt.D., F.B.A. (London: Cambridge at the University Press. 1938. Part I, Pp. lxxv + 513. Part II, Pp. 281. Price 45s. net.)

A reviewer's principal business is to tell his readers what to expect, and here I find myself in a certain difficulty. I find it hard to conjecture what expectations most readers are likely to entertain, although I can be pretty sure that their attitude, in most instances, is rather different from mine. I, along with Mr. Broad, was a pupil of McTaggart's when he made the first adumbration of his new philosophical system—then called "The Dialectic of Existence"—in a series of college lectures supernumerary to the official programme. Like puppies, we exercised our teeth upon his arguments, but we probably did less damage than puppies commonly do. Nevertheless, I have a rather special interest both in the later forms of McTaggart's great metaphysical adventure, and in the opinions about it that Mr. Broad has formulated in his distinguished maturity.

Let me then say certain things in general. McTaggart's *Nature of Existence* and Mr. Broad's *Examination* of it together comprise about a million words in the proportion of rather more than three of Broad to two of McTaggart. That is a lot of metaphysics. Indeed, when Mr. Broad, in the preface to the present (concluding) instalments of his work, congratulates himself upon being able to turn to other matters after the completion of his Five Years' Plan, and says that "enough is as good as a feast," one is tempted to suspect that he has rather Gargantuan notions of sufficiency. But of course there is a place for feasts, and the fear of over-nutrition may be baseless. Mr. Broad is very thorough but seldom, if ever, prolix; and thoroughness is a welcome quality.

The situation as a whole is full of interest. Mr. Broad is the most eminent of contemporary middle-aged British philosophers and he is examining one of the three or four outstanding British philosophers during the first quarter of the present century. Elaborate commentaries by eminent philosophers upon contemporary or near-contemporary philosophers of comparable eminence are rather rare although they are not unknown. One thinks, for instance, of Leibniz's *Nouveaux Essais* or, on a lower but still upon a high plane, Mill's *Examination of Hamilton*. For the most part, however, elaborate commentaries deal with the great who have been dead a long time, but whose works continue to live. Most commentaries upon contemporaries or near-contemporaries are written by lesser men and are either polemical or provisional or both. Here we have precisely the opposite case. Mr. Broad aims, if not at finality, at something as near to finality as any detached, industrious and able commentator has ever aimed at, and his book, although severely critical, is not a polemic. The conditions of its origin favour piety and not polemics. Polemics are roused by books of wide influence that (in the enemy's view) are dangerous if not positively pernicious. That is not what happens here. McTaggart, according to Mr. Broad, was remarkable for his dialectical skill and virtuosity even when compared with men of Leibniz's stature or of Hegel's; he had certain other marks of philosophical greatness in a high degree; but his influence has not been and is not likely to be very great even

among the *élite*, to say nothing of the rabble. Consequently he could not be very dangerous or very pernicious even if he had been mistaken in ways rather hard to detect.

The point invites pursuit. Why should McTaggart's philosophy be examined so sedulously by such a remarkably efficient commentator? Mr. Broad's fuller answer would seem to be, in effect, that the eminent clarity of McTaggart's dialectical skill gives other philosophers an unusual metaphysical opportunity. Very little time has to be wasted in discussing what the author may conceivably have meant. The argument's the thing, and it is nearly always quite plain what the argument is. Again, McTaggart was almost unique among the more ambitious dialecticians in exposing the cards that his system required him to play. Where Hegel or Bradley were content to suggest that certain paradoxical conclusions (such as the timelessness of reality or the spiritual transparency of apparently clouded sensory fact) *must* be, McTaggart tried to show in something like detail, what the thing that *must* be also *would* be. Hence a close examination of his philosophy has the signal merit of telling the world what a man lets himself in for if he accepts a metaphysical view that is apt to attract because it seems to be mystical and inspiring. Further, even if McTaggart's philosophy is top-heavy with dialectic, and thinnish about the keel because of its author's ignorance of natural science and contempt for history, it is still one of the best examples of an attempt to elicit consequences of great speculative and practical pith from *a priori* premisses that so far as may be are self-evident. Mr. Broad suggests unkindly that "speculative" philosophy is always a barren virgin unless she has clandestine intercourse with science or history; but many have thought the contrary.

The first two of these claims have a great deal of weight. The third seems slighter. In the first place its conclusion would be freely and generally accepted at the present time—perhaps too freely and too generally. There does not seem to be any urgent need for pointing this moral so very sedulously. Still, nails should be driven home, even when they seem pretty firm. It may therefore be expedient, although it may look a little officious, to fortify a principle that is very widely held; and that may be the case even when it is remembered that McTaggart's system was based very largely upon principles for which he did *not* claim self-evidence although he invariably claimed that they were ultimate. The distinction does not greatly affect his conception of the method and the possible power of metaphysical weapons. In the second place, however, it has to be remarked that McTaggart's failure as a philosophical architect (if such failure could be shown) would not prove that his conception of metaphysics was mistaken. It would only show that yet another grandiose metaphysics of this type had fallen by the way, despite the astonishing virtuosity of its designer. That would be a depressing result to certain hopeful people, but it need not have a very catholic significance.

At this point (I think) I may give the reader a little more information (and I admit that, up to the present, I haven't given him very much). One of the inevitable disadvantages in most philosophical systems that are at all elaborate is that the designers have to take so much pains about the internal technology of the system without any apparent net gain of a more general kind. Since nothing else is possible, nobody is entitled to complain. It is difficult, however, to retain a perfervid interest in such problems if the whole system sags, and, more particularly, if it cannot be restored by a technical reconstruction along similar lines. Unfortunately this difficulty is quite strikingly apparent in the present instance. McTaggart professed to be able to prove a great deal that was very important without the aid of his Principle of Determining Correspondence, but if that principle has to be abandoned the highest towers

of his imposing system become radically insecure, and Mr. Broad demolished the principle so thoroughly in the first volume of his *Examination* that I at least have no wish to attempt to restore it in any way at all. Consequently a great part of the eight hundred pages of this second volume is engaged in shadow-boxing, and in exercises of an anatomical kind that are subject to the objection that they are dealing with a chimerical organism that never was and never could have been viable. Mr. Broad (as he says) may have found much intellectual profit (and he has certainly displayed immense intellectual ability) in examining a broken lock that he knew to be broken and how. Where he has gained so much his readers, in a smaller way, may also gain. Indeed, anyone who follows his arguments closely has by that very circumstance attained a high-grade logical level. The benefit may therefore be considerable, but it is largely indirect, and there might be other and less oblique ways of learning to keep one's head.

I shall now try to answer a natural if a rather naughty question. Readers of Mill's *Examination of Hamilton* (let us say) might reasonably expect to learn a good deal from that work even if their knowledge of Hamilton himself did not appreciably exceed what the book said about him. Readers of Suarez upon St. Thomas might similarly learn a good deal without severe concurrent study of that doctor. Such an attitude on the reader's part is, one admits, regrettable in certain ways and is manifestly unfair to Hamilton or to St. Thomas as the case may be. Nevertheless, an adequate study both of McTaggart and of this commentary is a pretty big job. It is therefore of some moment to ask whether a reader of this *Examination* (and more specifically of the second volume of the *Examination* now under review) could expect a fat dividend if he had only a general knowledge of McTaggart's attitude, and read this book for its separate individual delectability.

On that I should report somewhat as follows: McTaggart was thoroughly dissatisfied with most of the attempts to prove ontological idealism (i.e. the spiritual constitution of reality), but he believed that he had found a better way to demonstrate that conclusion. This new way was arduous and involved a highly complicated metaphysical argument. The foundations were supplied in the first volume of *The Nature of Existence*, to which the first volume of this *Examination* corresponds. McTaggart's second volume (to which Mr. Broad's second volume corresponds) reaped the fruits of the first volume, and saw to it that the fruits were mature before the harvest. This harvest, as Mr. Broad says, may fairly be described as both exciting and complex. It involves a drastic re-analysis of the current psychological conceptions of conscious and of subconscious experience, a closer investigation than is common of the nature of selves, the rejection of time and its supplanting by eternity, a detailed review of human error, its genera, its cause and its cure, a prolonged examination of the pre- and post-existence of the human selves that now appear to exist, of the nature of value, of eternal love, and of optimism. These are all exciting topics, as metaphysicians count excitement, and those who are not metaphysicians should leave McTaggart and his examiner quite sternly alone.

Thus McTaggart's second volume contains the play to which the first was an extensive prologue, and the examiner taxes his remarkable powers to their fullest extent in consulting the reader's legitimate wants. He excels in exposition. For the most part he explains McTaggart's views in a lucid and compact independent statement; and he does not hinder the reader's itinerary by more than the necessary minimum of references and of quotations. He does not refer retrospectively to his own or to McTaggart's first volume except upon very rare occasions when he has no choice in the matter. McTaggart's second volume

may be read with profit and interest without more than a general (if accurate) recollection of the first. The same is true of the second volume of the *Examination*. In abundant stretches this volume is exciting and valuable for any philosopher. On the other hand, there are also long stretches necessarily concerned with McTaggart's technology. Mr. Broad has invented a much simpler notation than McTaggart's, but still a notation that requires close attention and is always ready to eat up the pages. Therefore most readers who are looking for honey would find plenty of it but would also find a lot of scentless vegetation. I am therefore rather sorry for such a reader. If he neglects the technological discussion he will miss more than he can afford to miss. If he gives his mind to it he may doubt whether the reward is proportionate. So his case is hard. However, there is at least a very full and a very accurate synopsis as well as clear general directions and properly labelled paragraphs. Readers of this type are treated as well as they could be treated, and can have no ground for complaining. The book was not written for them but it does not shut them out.

To say these things is to say that the book is in substance what it professes to be, viz. a commentary. It is also (as I have said) an untendentious commentary without an ulterior purpose. Therefore it has the limitations of its genre. So long as a commentator speaks to his brief he is, so to say, a tied philosopher. His author calls the tune. He pipes and dances to it, perhaps improving it vastly; but he is still its obedient servant. This state of affairs, when the commentator is the author's equal, tempers the reader's satisfaction. The commentator stops when the reader would like him to proceed. If the commentator is thorough (and Mr. Broad is devastatingly so) he elaborates each point of substance as and when it turns up. The justification for so full a treatment must often be only that the author treated it very fully. When Mr. Broad finds what he calls a "rookery of mares' nests" he has to fire separately upon every mare's nest in the rookery. The efficiency of the marksmanship does not always tempt a spectator to linger. It is not very thrilling. When we have found, for example, that McTaggart was fond of talking about quantity and measurement without having much more than a dangerous half-knowledge of that subject, we may be excused for having a certain impatience with the detailed exhibition of his defects in this particular, even if we ourselves share his taste and also his weakness. The policy of "Thorough" has certain drawbacks.

Speaking generally, however, it appears to me that Mr. Broad's second volume is more skilfully constructed than his first. The first volume seemed to stick rather too closely to MacTaggart's words and ways. When Mr. Broad made definitely independent contributions he marked them with a star. These constellations seemed sometimes to have a rather arbitrary origin, and some of their members were more dwarfish than the others. To our joy Mr. Broad has abandoned all that in the present volume, and has chosen instead to give us a steadier view of his own opinions. Sometimes he says, "I shall discuss this subject in my own way and apply the result to McTaggart's theory. Sometimes he says, "I shall put McTaggart's views in my own way and then say what I think about them." Both methods are somewhat unusual in a commentator, but they sensibly diminish (although they cannot overcome) the restraints to which a faithful commentary is necessarily subject. Hence the reader's interest is proportionately stimulated, and Mr. Broad has all the qualities that are necessary for his very diversified task, usually in an exceptionally high degree. There are few, if any, in the country who can match his skill in presenting a phenomenology of perception and of temporal process. His grasp of what used to be called psychology is firm and arresting. He has

a mastery of abstract logic and of the foundations of the quantitative sciences greatly superior to that of most contemporary philosophical writers. He is quite well versed in the thicket of puzzles in which what is called "value-theory" lurks to-day. Hence his arguments and conclusions have frequently a vivid interest largely additional to anything that McTaggart may have said.

If these remarks convey the impression that it would have been desirable to have had still more of Broad and far less of McTaggart, I hasten to supply the necessary corrective. There are parts of the subject in which Mr. Broad's views are more valuable than McTaggart's, and Mr. Broad is often crippled by being what he sets out to be, a commentator. Also (as I have said) McTaggart's ship was wrecked and, concerning parts of it, there is not an absorbing source of interest in the question whether it is broken up by a skilled workman, or is left to disintegrate in more casual ways. A failure in demonstration need not point the way to a better demonstration or, in the alternative, show that no healthy proof is possible. It may be, in substance, a dead loss. But McTaggart set himself a great task that few would conceive and fewer would execute. Hence his commentator is led into many discussions that he might not have raised had he developed an independent philosophy, and we, the readers, may gain in consequence. Something of the kind, I think, has happened in the present instance. The examination has forced the examiner to discuss much that, *sibi permissus*, he might reasonably have avoided. Again, to mention a point of considerable importance, it is illuminating to have these problems discussed by a pair of philosophers, both of whom write admirably, although in vastly different styles. I shall not try to compare their merits in this respect. I have always thought McTaggart one of the best writers on technical philosophical subjects in the entire history of the English language, but the complementary excellences of Mr. Broad's very characteristic style are a constant source of pleasure and of profit.

Having said so much I may further be asked whether I expect the reader to show what, to parody one of Mr. Broad's phrases, might be called "full expository acceptance" of this commentary. On that question I have already indicated my general opinions. It would be almost impossible for anyone to take more trouble over another man's ideas than Mr. Broad has done here. Had McTaggart been alive I have little doubt that he would have accepted the accuracy of Mr. Broad's account of his philosophy both in larger and in smaller matters and would have gladly admitted the legitimacy and value of his criticisms. That is not to say that he might not have replied very effectively to many of the criticisms; but lacking McTaggart's powers, I am afraid I am unequal to the task of venturing upon a counter-examination.

For myself, however (to mention no other matters), I confess that I should very much like to have some inkling of the views of McTaggart's post-existent spirit upon Mr. Broad's account of the Specious Present, and upon the distinction between continuants and occurrences in its relation to absolute becoming. On the former point I am substantially on Mr. Broad's side. The way in which McTaggart and many of his contemporaries and successors spoke of the Specious Present seems to me to have been an open scandal, and I greatly admire Mr. Broad's attempt to remove the scandal (together with his similar remarks upon the perception of spatial boundaries). Nevertheless, I doubt whether a presented temporal stretch does appear "to tail off uniformly from a maximum at its later boundary." I think we have to distinguish between what is ostensibly "going" and what is ostensibly "gone." The former is presented (although in part strictly past), but it seems to me that the appearance of "going" does not occur until the presented entity is very nearly gone, and so that a part of the presented stretch (although strictly past) does

not even seem to be "going." As to continuants and occurrents, I admire Mr. Broad's confidence in the ultimate metaphysical validity of this distinction, but have to confess that I do not share it. Indeed, I believe that McTaggart was in the right and his examiner in the wrong. What is the "absolute becoming" of a continuant except an occurrence? What is a continuant except its history? What ultimately is the distinction between what Mr. Broad calls "quasi-continuants" and genuine ones? I am also very doubtful about what Mr. Broad repeatedly says about "dispositions." I allow that in talking, e.g., about a self we include hypothetical propositions about what it would do or might have done. That is a legitimate way of speaking, but it does not prove that a self at any given time is more than its history up to that time (unless the "history" is a set of propositions about it) or that it is a (developing?) "continuant" that in some mysterious way takes to itself a "history."

But I must stop. I cannot, without arbitrariness, select such smaller questions for separate discussion, and *sub specie temporis* must acquiesce in the frustration of my desire to do so. I would only say that if any reader detects traces of what Mr. Broad would call "fulfilled aversion" in reading this review, I beg him to neglect my halting efforts and go to the book itself. He will have no fulfilled aversion if he reads as much of it as appeals to him, and then the rest (if any).

I have noticed very few misprints, or other instances of what I take to be slips. On page 19 (last line), (i) should be (ii). On page 148, l.17, "discretely" should be "discreetly." It seems to me that on page 309, lines 30 and 32, "last" should be "first" and "first" should be "last." In the neighbourhood of (and including) page 334 there is an eruption of the word "presently" that, although a Scot, I find puzzling. On page 785, "include" should be "includes."

JOHN LAIRD.

A Critical Exposition of the Philosophy of Leibniz. By BERTRAND RUSSELL, New impression with a new preface (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 1937. Pp. xxiii + 311. Price 12s. 6d.)

This book originally published in 1900 by the Cambridge University Press has been out of print for some time. It is now reissued by Allen & Unwin without any modification either of type or of paging, but with a new preface. The only thing that is changed is the paper and the binding.

The reissue is to be welcomed. Mr. Russell's discussions are always suggestive, however much one may disagree with his interpretation; and as the book has taken its place among the small number of influential expositions of Leibniz, it is very desirable that it should be generally accessible.

The main thesis of the book can be stated somewhat as follows. Any philosophy which is based on the notion of substance must be either a monistic pantheism, such as that of Spinoza, or a monadistic atheism (pp. 172, 185). A philosophy of substance cannot be theistic. Now Leibniz expounds a philosophy of substance which is both monadistic and theistic. The whole of the theological part is, however, not merely inconsistent with his philosophy, but extraneous to it, and can therefore be cut out from the main exposition of his philosophy. When this is done, the purely monadistic part can be shown to follow from five premisses, three of which are mutually inconsistent. Leibniz's philosophy is then inconsistent with itself, but his greatness as a philosopher is due to the fact that his work brings out clearly the inconsistency of his premisses.

I can only touch on a few important points. The first of Mr. Russell's premisses is, that every proposition has a subject and a predicate, and he thinks that this premiss is responsible for what he considers Leibniz's mistakes in the treatment of relations, aggregates, space, and time (pp. 12–15). He interprets Leibniz as holding that relations between terms are accidents of the mind contemplating the terms, that propositions about number are mental, that abstraction is falsification, and that space and time are subjective. For none of these entities can enter into strict subject-predicate propositions. Hence Mr. Russell regards the epithets which frequently occur in Leibniz, "a purely ideal being," "a being of reason," "a mental entity" (or more frequently, "a semi-mental entity") as "abusive epithets" (p. 129).

In all this, I think, Mr. Russell fails to do justice to Leibniz's treatment of ideal entities, and he fails because his first premiss really includes two distinct principles, which ought to be stated separately. The first of these can be called purely logical. It is that every proposition can be treated as a complex entity containing a number of notions, and asserting that one set of notions is contained in another set. This Leibniz holds of every proposition, however complex. In this sense he would agree that every proposition can be treated as having a subject and a predicate. But from this principle nothing of an ontological character would follow. For that we need a different principle, which is ontological. It is that nothing can be strictly said to be real which is not a substance. All entities not substances are ideal, and have when considered in themselves no existence, but are derived by some process, of abstraction, comparison, aggregation, etc., from substances. Though not real, they are, however, not nothing, and their consideration is important for the understanding of substances. They are akin in nature to eternal truths.

By including both these principles under the single principle that every proposition has a subject and a predicate, Mr. Russell can easily show that Leibniz's metaphysics follows from his logic. It would be equally easy to show that Leibniz's logic follows from his metaphysics. I believe that the whole dispute is futile, and that the two sides always went together in the thought of Leibniz.

Mr. Russell's third premiss is that "true propositions not asserting existence at particular times are necessary and analytic, but such as assert existence at particular times are contingent and synthetic." He admits that Leibniz does not use the terms analytic and synthetic, but he introduces them in order to make distinctions not clearly made by Leibniz, and argues that the use of the single pair, necessary and contingent, prejudices the issue in Leibniz's favour.

The reply to this is that the use of the new pair involves a misinterpretation of Leibniz. According to Mr. Russell, Leibniz holds that every true proposition referring to mere possibles is analytic and necessary. Contingency comes in only in regard (*a*) to propositions asserting that something exists, and (*b*) to propositions asserting a connection between various actual predicates of a particular substance. Mr. Russell puts it (p. 28): "All the predicates are necessarily connected with the subject, but no concrete predicates are necessarily connected with each other." The first part of this statement is incorrect. It misses the distinction Leibniz makes between metaphysical necessity and hypothetical necessity. Again, if by a synthetic proposition is meant what it meant for Kant, viz. one which asserts of a subject a predicate not contained in the notion of the subject, and if all contingent propositions are synthetic, then all Leibniz's discussions regarding contingency become nonsensical. For precisely what Leibniz asserts in those discussions is that there are two distinct ways in which a predicate can be contained in the notion of a subject

—two distinct kinds of *inesse*—one of which makes the proposition asserting the connexion necessary, the other makes it contingent. This second kind of *inesse* is found in the realm of possibles, as well as the first kind, and the proof of the connection—even within the realm of possibles—involves an unending process which is as different from that by which metaphysically necessary propositions are proved as the number 1·414 is from $\sqrt{2}$. It is just this difference which is the mark of contingency. There are thus two points in which Leibniz's account of contingency is in conflict with Mr. Russell's premiss: (i) it applies within the realm of possibles, (ii) contingent propositions are not synthetic.

Again, there are some statements in Leibniz which would give colour to Mr. Russell's view that propositions asserting actual existence are synthetic, but this view is nevertheless quite out of keeping with the main tendency of Leibniz's philosophy, and there are far more passages asserting the contrary. A synthetic proposition would, in fact, be a proposition which asserted a connection between S and P without any ground in the nature of S. And it is just this which Leibniz always denies, on the basis of his principle of sufficient reason. There are, of course, many difficulties involved in Leibniz's treatment of actual existence, of which the critical one is seen when it is asked in what way the notion of a substance considered as possible differs from the notion of the same substance actually existing. If there is no difference, then existence is not a predicate. If there is a difference, then existence is a predicate not contained in the notion of the substance considered as possible. Mr. Russell thinks Leibniz accepts the second alternative, and considers that he ought to have accepted the first. Thus Mr. Russell uses the second as the basis of his account of contingent propositions as synthetic, while pressing the first against Leibniz's ontological proof of God's existence. Leibniz was himself aware of the difficulty, and tried to meet it by defining existence as a predicate, but as a predicate different in character from ordinary predicates, and as having a different meaning as applied to God from the meaning it has as applied to created substances. A discussion of this would involve an article in itself; but one illustration will serve to show the trend of Leibniz's thought, and at the same time bring out a feature which occurs several times in Mr. Russell's treatment of Leibniz.

In his new preface (p. vi) Mr. Russell quotes a sentence from a paper of 1686 printed by Couturat in his *Opuscules et Fragments Inédits de Leibniz*, which he translates as follows: "I say therefore that the existent is the being which is compatible with most things, or the most possible being, so that all coexistent things are equally possible." Mr. Russell then proceeds to show the strange consequences which follow from this if it is taken as a definition of existence in the strict sense: no act of creation would be needed, no divine decree, and so on; and he concludes: "Here, as elsewhere, Leibniz fell into Spinozism whenever he allowed himself to be logical; in his published works, accordingly, he took care to be illogical."

Now the reader who turns up the passage in Couturat (p. 376) will find a curious fact. The sentence quoted is immediately succeeded by, "Or, what comes to the same thing, the existent is what pleases an intelligent and powerful being"; and then Leibniz goes on to note that this presupposes such a being to exist, so that the attempted definition will not do as it stands, and he goes on to modify it.[1]

Mr. Russell's treatment is a good example of what I may call the *malicious* school of historical interpretation, which consists in the neglect of contexts

[1] For a discussion of some other passages, see Couturat, "Sur la Métaphysique de Leibniz," *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale*, Jan. 1902, p. 13.

and backgrounds. In its context, Leibniz's suggested definition is an attempt to meet the difficulty already mentioned about the relation between possibility and existence. § 71 of this paper (p. 375) came to the conclusion that when we say *A* exists we mean that existence is contained in the notion of *A*. But then (§ 73) the question arises, what existence can mean beyond possibility, i.e. beyond essence. And Mr. Russell's quotation is the first provisional answer. By taking it out of its context, Mr. Russell gives it an interpretation it cannot bear in its context. For in its context it is restricted to created or dependent existence; by taking it out of its context Mr. Russell gives it the air of a definition of existence without any restriction.

Mr. Russell has made no alterations in his 1900 text, so that on page 124, note 1, the error is still repeated that the term monad was used by Leibniz for the first time in 1696, and on page 188, note 1, the conclusion drawn by Stein from this erroneous date, viz. that Leibniz probably derived the term from van Helmont, is still accepted. Leibniz used the term monad in a letter to de l'Hospital dated 12/22 July 1695 (G.M. II 294). The only modern writer of a book on Leibniz who is aware of this, so far as I know, is Iwanicki, in his *Leibniz et les démonstrations mathématiques de l'existence de Dieu* (1933). (I pointed it out myself in the Proc. Arist. Soc. 1922-23.)

The shadow of Spinoza lies over Mr. Russell's Leibniz. This is partly due to Mr. Russell's belief that if Leibniz wanted a God he had no logical right to any but Spinoza's; but there is also a general suggestion that Leibniz borrowed a great deal from Spinoza without acknowledging the debt. Mr. Russell is here, I think, too much influenced by Stein's *Leibniz und Spinoza*, a book which is in my opinion a very bad one, though very cleverly written. The only safe way of dealing with Stein is to look up the contexts of all his references, and to refuse to draw positive conclusions from negative evidence. Mr. Edwyn Bevan, in his *Stoics and Sceptics* (1913), mentions Stein's *Die Psychologie der Stoa* as "the worst book upon Stoicism which I know," and warns those beginning the study of the subject against it (preface, p. 6). I have the same feeling about his *Leibniz und Spinoza*. It is still needed, however, for some of the letters by and to Leibniz printed in the appendix. The Berlin edition of Leibniz is, e.g., misleading in regard to the correspondence of Schuller with Leibniz concerning the distribution of the copies of Spinoza's *Opera*, not printing the letter of February 6, 1678, in which Schuller definitely says he has dispatched a copy to Leibniz. It was on the basis of the Berlin edition of Leibniz's philosophical correspondence (forgetful of the letters printed in Stein) that I allowed myself to play with the idea that Leibniz might have received his copy in November 1677, in an essay which I contributed to the recent volume of *Seventeenth Century Studies*, presented to Sir Herbert Grierson. The point was not of any importance for my purpose; but it illustrates the unfortunate position of the student of Leibniz in regard to his sources. He must not permit himself to depend on any single collection of Leibniz's works. From a somewhat similar point of view the collection of passages printed in Mr. Russell's appendix should not be regarded as anything more than a set of signposts to the fuller passages from which they have been excerpted. For Leibniz, of all people, contexts and backgrounds are important.

In his new preface Mr. Russell cites Couturat's *La Logique de Leibniz* and his collection of the *Fragments Inédits* of Leibniz as fully confirming his own views. Couturat's view of the metaphysics of Leibniz is to be found in the article in the *Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale* for January 1902, to which I have already referred. Like everything Couturat wrote, it is of very great value: but an examination of it would be out of place in this review.

L. J. Russell.

Philosophy and the Physicists. By L. S. Stebbing. (London: Methuen & Co. 1937. Pp. xvi + 295. Price 7s. 6d.)

Professor Stebbing's book is intended to assess the philosophical value, if any, of the numerous works in which certain eminent scientists have expounded to the general public what they consider to be the implications of recent developments in mathematical physics. The writers whom she mainly discusses are Sir James Jeans and Sir Arthur Eddington. She complains, with some justice, that they both "approach their task through an emotional fog," and both "present their views with an amount of personification and metaphor that reduces them to the level of revivalist preachers." This is a severe judgment, but it appears to me to be amply borne out by my own experience in reading their works, and by the quotations which Miss Stebbing gives. I find myself in complete agreement with her remark on p. 18, that "the fundamental objection to the modes of expression so dear to Eddington and Jeans . . . is that such writing obfuscates the common reader whilst pretending to enlighten him."

The two writers under discussion are, as Miss Stebbing recognizes, of very different calibre when considered as contributors to philosophy. There is no evidence that Jeans has any serious contribution to make, and Miss Stebbing disposes of his puerilities in a couple of chapters. This massacre is too much like knocking down a sitting bird to be of much interest, and Miss Stebbing devotes the rest of her book to the more sportsmanlike exercise of peppering Eddington as he flits from one metaphor to another. No one who has read Eddington's works can doubt that he has a genuine interest in philosophical questions, and one suspects that he may have something of importance to say about them. But any philosophically trained reader is troubled by two defects. The first is stated by Miss Stebbing on p. 55. "He has nowhere expounded his philosophical ideas in non-popular language." It is therefore very difficult to know whether his ideas are as confused as his language often is. The second defect, which Miss Stebbing does not explicitly mention, is this. Most of the problems which Eddington discusses lead at the first or the second move into territory with which professional philosophers have long been familiar. This is full of linguistic and other pitfalls, many of which have been discovered, mapped out, and fenced round by philosophers in the course of ages. Anyone who enters these regions without having studied the most recent maps, and without knowing and using the technical apparatus which philosophers have devised in order to reduce the risks of exploration, is almost certain to fall into fallacies himself, or to lead his followers into them. Now there is no evidence in Eddington's writings that he has made the least attempt to prepare himself for philosophical investigation by studying the work of experts in the subject. (His naïve use of the mouldy old metaphor of the "telephone-exchange," e.g., is a case in point.) Of course no one can blame a man for not studying a foreign subject when he has been engaged in making the most profound and original contributions to his own science, which has been changing and advancing with unprecedented rapidity. And no one wants Eddington to stick entirely to his last and renounce his interest in philsosphy. Still, the fact remains that his lack of technical philosophical training, however excusable it may be, *is* a most serious handicap to him in his excursions into philosophy.

The result of all this is that Eddington does lay himself open to very serious criticisms from a competent and clear-headed thinker with a thorough knowledge of contemporary analytical philosophy, such as Miss Stebbing. And it is very difficult to believe that all the *verbal* confusions which she

undoubtedly detects and points out are *merely* verbal. In order that the reader may judge of this for himself, I will now go rapidly through Miss Stebbing's book, mentioning briefly the more important of her criticisms.

The book is divided into four parts. In Part I Sir James Jeans is disposed of, and we need not linger to dance over his corpse. Part II is entitled *The Physicist and the World*. It describes, in four chapters, Eddington's views of the relation of physics to the external world, and to human sense-experience. In the first of these, *Furniture of Earth*, Miss Stebbing deals severely with Eddington's talk about his "two tables," the familiar and the scientific one; with the statement that the table is not "really" solid; and so on. She suggests that it is as meaningless to talk of a "*scientific* table" as to talk of a "*familiar* electron or quantum." And she contends that, unless tables and floors were "really solid," we should not understand what was being said when we were told that certain other things or collections, e.g. a swarm of flies or the duck-weed on a pond, are *not* really solid.

The second of these chapters, entitled *The Symbolic World of Physics*, contains an attempt to elucidate Eddington's statement that the aim of science is to "construct a world which shall be symbolic of the world of commonplace experience." Miss Stebbing begins by explaining Eddington's contention that there are three kinds of law—identical, statistical, and controlling. She then makes some criticisms on points of detail in Eddington's attempt to construct, from the minimum of data, a mathematical scheme in which the metrical, gravitational, and electro-magnetic fields are all included. She ends, however, by admitting that "*given the provision of adequate building material*, such an inclusive construction could be made." But she attacks Eddington's conclusion that such laws as the conservation of mass, energy, momentum, the law of gravitation, and Maxwell's equations, are mere truisms and not controlling laws. I think that her doctrine can be stated as follows. Beside the three kinds of law distinguished by Eddington, there are certain observable regularities in human sense-experience. She proposes to call these "natural laws," as contrasted with Eddington's "laws of Nature." Eddington pays lip-service to the importance of these, but Miss Stebbing thinks that he fails to take them seriously. Actually the concepts of mathematical physics were constructed and the laws of Nature were formulated in view of these natural laws. And, even if it had been possible in theory to start from the other end and construct an abstract system of mathematical physics in which the concepts and the laws are so interconnected that the laws are truisms, there is no guarantee whatever that anything would have been found in our sensible experience to answer to the concepts and to obey the laws.

An important point which Miss Stebbing makes in this chapter is that there seems to be some kind of mystification in Eddington's writings due to the metaphorical word "building." There seems to be a suggestion that, because physical scientists "build" the system of concepts which is theoretical physics, therefore in some sense everyone of us "builds" the external world to which these concepts apply.

In the next chapter, *The Descent to the Inscrutable*, Miss Stebbing tries to discover the senses in which Eddington uses the phrases "the familiar world," "the external world," "the scientific world," "the physical world," "Nature," "the world of physics," and "the spiritual world," and how he supposes that these worlds are related to each other. What she finally condenses from clouds of metaphor may be roughly summarized as follows. The *external world* is known only as that which is capable of "sending messages" along nerve-fibres to people. These fibres are themselves part of the external world, and one end

of each fibre leads into the brain of some person, which is, presumably, also a part of the external world. Each person's mind is inside his head, and the inner end of each fibre is "in consciousness." Each mind thus "receives the messages" which are conveyed from the external world through nerve-fibres to its brain. It then and there, without being conscious of doing so, "transforms" and "dresses up" the messages in spatial, substantial, coloured, scented forms. And finally it becomes conscious of these products of its own unwitting action. The *familiar world* is the world of chairs, tables, trees, and the common things of daily life. But, in consequence of the theory about the external world, the messages, the transforming, and dressing-up, etc., Eddington concludes that the familiar world is a delusion, spun by the mind of each of us for himself under the mistaken impression that he is just translating messages from the external world. The two phrases, "the *scientific* world" and "the *world of physics*," are almost certainly synonymous. But it is extremely difficult to know what is meant by "the *physical* world," and how it is related to "Nature" and to "the world of physics." Miss Stebbing quotes a number of passages which show the difficulty in discovering what Eddington means by these terms. The most plausible view of his meaning seems to be that the physical world is a complex of metrical symbols, that these symbols "shadow" the familiar world, but that experience as a whole contains more than can be shadowed by metrical symbols.

Naturally Miss Stebbing has little difficulty in making hay of all this talk of "messages," "mind-spinning," "editors," "shadowing," and so on. Eddington seems never to have asked himself the question: "If the relation between the external world and the familiar world and myself were as I have stated, how could I possibly *know* or have *any rational ground for believing* it to be so?" He seems never to have considered seriously what is involved in the metaphor of "messages," "symbolizing," and "decoding." I think that it is in this part of his philosophy, more than in any other, that his lack of familiarity with the work of competent professional philosophers has let him down.

These criticisms are carried further in the next chapter, called *Consequences of Scrutinizing the Inscrutable*, which Miss Stebbing prefaces with a cryptogram concealing a quotation from Eddington's writings. She begins by pointing out, quite correctly, that "Eddington has not attempted, and has never felt the need to attempt, to deduce religion from modern physics, or to base religion on scientific discovery." His contention is that physics itself, as a science, requires a certain supplementation which the physicist as such cannot provide. Physics is concerned only with "pointer-readings" and their interconnections. These correspond in certain ways to sensible objects in the *familiar* world, but the latter are merely products of "mind-spinning." It seems obvious to Eddington that the pointer-readings and their interconnections must, as he puts it, be "attached to some unknown background" in the *external* world. E.g. colours, which he regards as mental products, symbolize electro-magnetic waves in the world of physics, and electro-magnetic waves in turn symbolize something in the external world whose intrinsic nature is unknown.

Miss Stebbing naturally asks: "How, on Eddington's own principles, can he know or even suspect that physical entities symbolize anything whatever?" She carefully analyses Eddington's examples of the antiquarians who discover a book of completed chess-games, after all knowledge of chess has been lost; of decoding cryptograms; and of assigning certain call-signals to certain wireless-stations. She points out that in every such case it is essential for the deciphering individual to have certain detailed knowledge to which

there could be no analogy in the case of an individual who treats a physical entity as a symbol of an unknown something.

Lastly, even if one did somehow acquire the idea of an "unknown background," and did somehow come to believe that physical entities symbolize items in it, how could one hope to learn anything further about the items which they symbolize? Eddington's answer seems to be as follows. There is one sensible object, viz. one's own brain, such that the pointer-readings which correspond to it in the world of physics symbolize something that is known to oneself *directly* as a thinking and willing subject. The suggestion is that this can be generalized and extended to the objects symbolized by other sets of pointer-readings. Miss Stebbing's criticism is as follows. No one is aware of *his own* brain either as a sensible object or as a set of pointer-readings, though a person may be aware of *another's* brain as a set of pointer-readings. Each person is directly aware *only of himself*, and never of another, as a thinking and willing subject. Hence no one is in a position to make the identification which Edington postulates.

Part III is concerned with Causality and Human Freedom. In the first chapter Miss Stebbing explains how the problem presented itself to Huxley and to Mill. (There is a delightful misprint in the Bibliography on p. 288, where a synthetic "eminent Victorian" is exhibited under the name of "Thomas *Hill* Huxley." Miss Stebbing confesses that she cannot abide Huxley, and I should like to believe that this is what has caused her to conflate him with Green.)

In the second chapter Miss Stebbing explains what is meant by a "deterministic scheme of law," with reference to the Laplacean ideal calculator. She explains that it has room for statistical laws, but that it regards them as derivative from deterministic laws. She then gives an account, first of Bohr's model of the atom, and then of Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle; and shows how they are incompatible with a completely deterministic scheme of law. In quantum phenomena the Laplacean calculator could not begin his calculations, because he could not know the initial conditions precisely; and this lack of knowledge would not be due to any defect in his mind or his instruments, it would be inherent in the very nature of physical measurement. We have now to accept statistical laws which are not derivable from deterministic laws. She ends the chapter by saying that "the discovery of the uncertainty relations does involve a considerable change in our attitude to determinism," and by expressing a doubt whether it has precisely those philosophical consequences which Jeans and Eddington believe it to have.

In the next chapter Miss Stebbing considers the consequences and tries to justify her doubt. She reduces the inquiry to the following three questions: (1) Is there any sense in which it is true to say that science *has been* based on determinism? (2) What is the connection between determinism, prediction, and rationality? (3) Why should there be such glee, in some quarters, and such gloom, in others, at the rejection of determinism?

The discussion of the first question is lengthy, and not, I think, very well arranged. In the course of it Miss Stebbing says that she herself feels difficulties in the notion that statistical laws are fundamental; that she is not sure that these difficulties may not be due to prejudice; that she is open to conviction; and that this notion will not become clear until it has been associated with a satisfactory theory of probability in general and of *a priori* probability in particular. This seems to me to be a good point. Next she observes that we did not need to wait for the Uncertainty Principle in order to know that all prediction by means of physical laws is uncertain. Even if we could have kept to the deterministic scheme, our belief in any alleged law would have

been at best highly probable opinion and never certain knowledge. She thinks that Eddington has made statements which are likely to mislead his readers on this matter. Then she enumerates and discusses four different alternatives in connexion with the interpretation of Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle. She thinks that Eddington accepts the third of these, and Heisenberg the second, which, in her opinion, excludes the third. The fourth is her own suggestion, and I must confess that I do not understand it. In two successive paragraphs on p. 202, referring to this fourth alternative, she says (*a*) that it would be generally admitted that space and time, "in any ordinary sense," *have no significance in the microphysical domain*, and (*b*) that "we encounter only bodies that are *very large compared with an electron*." It is not easy to reconcile the clauses which I have italicized in these two statements. Lastly, Miss Stebbing makes a severe, and in my opinion wholly justified, criticism on the extremely confused and confusing use which Eddington makes of the word "inference," with special reference to his statement that "the world of physics is populated with *inferences*," and to his muddled remarks about "the shadow of the moon on Cornwall in 1999" being "already in the world of *inference*." All these discussions are interesting and important; but I am not left at the end of them with any very clear idea of Miss Stebbing's answer to her original question, viz. "Was science ever based on determinism?"

After this long discussion of her first question, Miss Stebbing considers that she is justified in answering her second question in a few lines. I gather that she agrees with Eddington that intelligibility is not bound up with a scheme of deterministic laws, and that it is quite compatible with the Uncertainty Principle and with the ultimate laws of physics being statistical.

Her third question may be taken along with the next chapter, entitled *Human Freedom and Responsibility*, for "the glee of some" at the recent setback to physical determinism is due to the fact that they think that physics now leaves room for freedom and responsibility, whilst formerly it did not.

The point with which Eddington is specially concerned here is the following. Certain bodily movements, such as intelligent speaking and writing, express the conclusions of processes of reasoning. Others are actions or abstentions which accord with a resolution which has been made after a considerable mental struggle. Now Eddington is concerned with the possibility that such bodily movements are not *completely* determined by physical causes. He assumes that, if they were so determined, they could not be *also* determined in any degree by the mental processes, such as reasoning and resolving, which led up to the experience which these movements express. If, on the other hand, they are not completely determined by physical causes, these mental processes may have been essential factors in their causal ancestry. This is, of course, the view of common sense, and it seems to be part of what we mean when we hold ourselves responsible for our speaking, writing, and keeping or breaking of resolutions.

Now Eddington admits that the Principle of Indeterminacy does not leave nearly a wide enough loophole to make any practical difference here. He has to postulate a measure of *macroscopic* indeterminacy in the case of human brains and nervous systems, which the principle will not guarantee. Miss Stebbing insists on this fact, and considers that Eddington is altogether on the wrong line. She holds, so far as I can understand, that the only hopeful line of attack is to show, *not* that physics can be reconciled with the fact of responsibility, but that no reconciliation is needed because there is really no conflict. She is inclined to think that Eddington tacitly accepts the uncritical dualism of the plain man; that this leads to pseudo-problems; and that what is needed is a radical discussion of the notion of a psycho-physiological *person*

and of the distinction which a person draws between himself and his environment.

In the earlier part of Chapter X Miss Stebbing discusses the notion of responsibility on her own account, and mentions and criticizes recent attempts by Mr. Wisdom, Prof. L. J. Russell, and the present reviewer to analyse it and to trace its implications. Mr. Wisdom's treatment is described as "curiously old-fashioned"; and a criticism on it by Miss Helen Smith, which may be annihilating in its full context, but is certainly not very convincing as quoted by Miss Stebbing, receives extremely high marks. I think we may summarize this part of the book by saying that Miss Stebbing here confines herself to "warming the teapot," but that she does this with such virtuosity that we are encouraged to hope for another book in which she will make delicious tea.

Lastly, she is inclined to think that the Uncertainty Principle and the correlated changes in physics have one and only one legitimate bearing on the question of freedom and responsibility. They reinforce, in a particularly obvious way, a fact which is well known to all competent philosophers, but is constantly ignored in popular discussions on free-will and determinism, viz. the fact that "compulsion" is no part of the meaning of causal determination. And they give the quietus to the notion of the physical world as a kind of machine, an image which has often been carried over to human beings, and has played an important and detrimental part in the free-will controversy. "Nothing could be a more inadequate image for a human being," says Miss Stebbing, "than a pot or a machine, unless it be a hazy collection of qualities accidentally collocated and labelled with a name."

The fourth Part, which concludes the book, is entitled *The Changed Outlook*, and consists of two chapters. The first of these is concerned with the Second Law of Thermodynamics, and with Eddington's suggestion of an "entropy-clock" in the human brain, which gives us our notion of the direction of temporal process. Miss Stebbing considers that this suggestion is a silly solution of a meaningless problem. She asks the pertinent question: "If increase of entropy is the criterion of the distinction of earlier from later, how was it discovered that entropy increases *as time goes on*?"

The last chapter deals in a deservedly destructive way with the attempts of some foolish people to extract a tonic for their religious or ethical ideals from the latest speculations and discoveries of physics.

In conclusion, I would express the opinion that we owe a debt of gratitude to Miss Stebbing for absenting herself for a while from the felicity of her own proper studies in order to do a much-needed work of intellectual scavenging. The labour itself cannot have been particularly pleasant for her, and she must often have felt that she might be better occupied than in clearing up the messes made by amateur philosophers. But at the end of it she must have enjoyed something of the exhilaration of a good housewife who has at last completed her spring-cleaning; and, were it not for the ill-omened associations of the phrase, we might congratulate her and her readers on the house being now "swept and garnished." C. D. Broad.

Time and its Importance in Modern Thought. By M. F. Cleugh. (London: Methuen & Co. 1937. Pp. x + 308. Price 12s. 6d.)

This work was written as a thesis for the degree of Ph.D. in the University of London. Happy is the university that can extract such learning from its candidates for research degrees!

The scope of the thesis is a general survey of contexts in which "time" crops up, such as psychology, physics, logic, prediction, irreversibility, and it includes a critical discussion of the views of Kant, Bergson, Alexander, McTaggart, Broad, Dunne and others, strange bedfellows as some of these make. Whilst there is some sitting on the fence, and some prolixity of illustrative examples, the whole of the work is of interest. Perhaps the essential telling conclusions and views are somewhat buried in the mass, but they are always refreshing.

It is a pity that writers on time are not forbidden the use of the word "time" altogether. We should perhaps then be surer what is being talked about—whether instant, the temporal sequence, interval, duration, becoming, the moving present, memory, simultaneity, periodicity, and so on, and we could thus avoid what Dr. Cleugh so often calls the hypostatization of time. Part of the trouble of the reader in studying Dr. Cleugh is to know when she is subscribing to this erection of time into a thing-in-itself, and when she is taking the more positivist view that there is no entity "time" with which we have any acquaintance but simply an ordered happening of events *at ourselves*. If only Dr. Cleugh had emphasized, in her own mind and for the benefit of the reader's, this prime fact of experience, how many circumlocutions and daisy-picking pathways back to her starting-point she would have saved herself! For example, in the chapter on physics she pays at least lip-service to the result of relativity that the simultaneity of two *distant* events is a matter of convention; in the chapter on logic she states that "the theory of relativity does not affect the certainty of the observer that two events, to him, took place at the same time; hence the great importance of drawing a particular distinction between experienced simultaneity and simultaneity in the sense or senses in which it is used in physics." But "experienced simultaneity" refers to events in the observer's consciousness, *at* the observer, a simultaneity which is assessed by an immediate judgment, and it is used in this sense in physics, *for events at* the observer; physics shows that it is the simultaneity or non-simultaneity of two events not at the observer which is conventional. Yet on p. 213 (rather late on in the book) she says that "objectively it must be true that they (i.e. two events) are simultaneous or that one did in fact happen before the other, and it is this 'happening' which is absolute and fundamental—and which is entirely unaffected by any stellar traveller." What does she mean by "objectively"? We have only different observers' different assignments of simultaneity or non-simultaneity to the two events. I suspect that she has not really understood the master-discovery of Einstein, or grasped the importance of the circumstance that judgments as to simultaneity can only be made by the observer for events *at himself*.

Again, on p. 5 there occurs the sentence "the problem of time is one of the hardest with which the philosopher has to deal," but what is meant by "the problem of time" we have not yet been told. Even to ask this question is to indulge in that hypostatization of time which the author so often condemns, and rightly. If the problem is "What is time?" the author gives her answer on p. 278 by saying that "we are bound to take time as an ultimate datum and to take a very simple view of it as being the name we give to the happenings of events." But this is a definition, not a problem. We should first define time, then state a problem arising out of the definition. The author expands her meaning by saying that "A happens, and then B happens, and both 'happening' and 'and then' are to be taken as ultimate." But this misses precision. As above, "and then" applies only to happenings at the observer, as an immediate judgment. A little later she answers her question "What is

time?" in a single phrase as "the alogical element in the universe," which is a metaphysical judgment, in contrast to the former psychological one. There seems to the reviewer to be no justification for the imputation of alogicality to time; it seems to derive from the view that static or timeless geometry is the furthest extension of logic. But geometry is just logic working in a field where the axioms are axioms of order, and it can be properly extended to a field in which the element "point" is replaced by the element "event" and events are ordered according to an axiom assigning a temporal sequence at the observer. The analysis of moving sets of points is just as logical as that of stationary sets. The author maintains (p. 282) that logic, in the sense of abstract consistency, is seriously insufficient by reason of its exclusion of time. But I am unable to understand what is meant by this "time" which logic is held to exclude, more especially as I appreciate the many wise things the author has to say as to the merely grammatical appearance of time.

After these criticisms it is a pleasure to recognize the author's strong common sense on the subject of irreversibility. "I am inclined to think that the question of irreversibility is in a sense almost irrelevant to time, and that what we mean by the unidirectionality of time is not a matter of 'musts' and 'cannots' but just a matter of fact. It just happens so" (p. 223). Again, "we are enabled to take the very simple and, I think, correct view that the happening of events is ultimate and transcends any talk of reversibility. As far as time-order is concerned it seems to me unmeaning to ask if it could be 'reversed.'" Apart from the hedging "in a sense," this is admirable; if we mean by time-order a sequence at the observer, then the events just *have* this order—if we take them in any other, it is not the time-order.

To go back to the "problem of time," the reviewer concedes at once that there is much more to our temporal cognitions than simple awareness of a simultaneity or of a before-and-after relation for events at the observer: there is the immediate awareness of a distinction between two rates of change as viewed, and its integrated form in the immediate awareness or impression of one interval being greater or less than another, however the impression may be related to the corresponding physical measures; there is the impression of something more than the element "instant" in the "specious present"; there is the consciousness of something real in the vague notion of a "future" event; there is the greater blurredness (or sometimes acuteness) of more distant memories; and so on. Any comprehensive metaphysic or psychological treatment must fuse these together. But it is important to recognize that physics by itself can be constructed on the basis of one of these judgments alone—the before-and-after relation for events at the observer. This axiom of order amongst events proves ultimately to be adequate for setting up satisfactory schemes of time-measurement, but of course only after considerable analysis. One example of such analysis is contained in the work of Robb. An analysis of a more general kind can be constructed on the following lines.

The crude, older view was that we measure time (that is, the physicists measure time) by using a periodic phenomenon. The trouble then is that we have no test by which we can assess a phenomenon as strictly periodic, unless we use laws of mechanics stated in terms of the very time-measure we are anxious to fix, so that we have no absolute means of knowing the laws of mechanics to be true. Clearly no fundamental analysis can be carried out along this circular route. We must attempt to erect a scheme of time-measurement on the sole basis of our axiom of order. Here the reviewer parts company with his author. "All measurement," she says (p. 39), "of whatever kind, depends on the use of a standard unit." This is to be in far too much

of a hurry. Primitive systems of measurement rarely depend on the use of a unit; they depend on the use of ordinal numbers. For example, primitively *visibility* is measured on a scale of one to ten; *winds* are measured on the Beaufort scale; *earthquakes* used to be measured on the Rossi-Forel scale; and there is an ordinal scale of *hardness* described in the most used collection of laboratory tables. The most familiar example of an ordinal scale is the empirical temperature scale—Fahrenheit or Centigrade—which arbitrarily assigns equal steps of temperature to equal increments in the expansion of a column of mercury. True, equality of increment is tested by comparison with a standard length (say 1 mm.), but the resulting measure of temperature is essentially ordinal; the equal subdivision of the standard length, even when this has been satisfactorily defined, affords no guarantee of equal subdivision of the degree of temperature. Such thermometer readings are ultimately made "absolute" by an appeal to a law of nature—the second law of thermodynamics. These examples suggest that for time-measurement, where the observer is *par excellence* in a position to arrange events in an order, an arbitrary ordinal measure of time is the logical starting-point. An arbitrary correlation of events at the observer with members of the well-ordered continuum of real numbers may be said to constitute a *clock* for that observer, arbitrarily graduated.

Having got thus far, and defined a clock, we can propound genuine problems as opposed to our author's "What is time?" The first fundamental problem of this kind is now this: given one observer A with his clock (arbitrarily graduated), can he convey information to a second observer B not coincident with A (and so possibly "moving" in any manner relative to A) so that B can graduate *his* clock (or temporal experience) in such a way that a meaning can be attached to saying that the two observers possess clocks identically graduated? And, if so, how? For these questions to have a meaning, it must be possible for the two observers to communicate with one another; for in the absence of intercommunication each observer could graduate his clock arbitrarily. Such communication amounts to the transmission of light-signals. Assuming no properties of light save that a light-signal dispatched from A and reflected back by B returns to A at a clock-reading *later* than the clock-reading of dispatch, this problem can be solved. Its solution depends on a study of symmetry relations, but the space of a review does not permit the solution to be reproduced here.

The second problem then is: if A, having arbitrarily graduated his clock, conveys information to B, C, D . . . so that each graduates his clock in the same way as A has done, what are the restrictions on the "motions" of B, C, D . . . relative to A (i.e. what conditions are satisfied by A's observations of B, C, D . . .) for B's clock now to be identical with C's, and so for each possible pair? This problem can also be solved. When all these conditions are satisfied, the class of observers A, B, C . . . possess a common measure of time. Out of this class of observers various kinematic entities can be constructed, analogous to "figures" in geometry. The third problem is to determine the theorems which state properties of these (moving) figures—in other words, the dynamical laws which will be followed in the presence of such kinematic constructs. This is another technical problem, but it can also be solved by using sufficient logical pressure, and it can be shown how to construct kinematic entities which actually obey the laws of dynamics inferred to hold good in their presence. The fourth problem is: can we find a *regraduation* of A's originally arbitrarily graduated clock such that the restatement of the inferred laws of dynamics in terms of the newly graduated time-scale coincides with the statement of the laws of dynamics known to empirical

physics? This problem, again, can be solved. We can then make an appeal to experience and identify the mode of time-measurement constructed by purely logical processes, as regraduated, with the time-measure τ of ordinary physics. We are then able to *account for* the origin of this measure τ of physical time if the universe as a whole exhibits the character of that kinematic entity in the presence of which the "laws of nature" in question were inferred to hold good. Modern astronomical research—we make our last appeal to experience—shows that the system of the nuclei of the extra-galactic nebulae may be identified with such a kinematic entity. The universe is thus fundamentally its own clock; and the distribution in it of matter-in-motion provides it with both a system of time-measurement and a set of dynamical (and gravitational) laws, and we thus realize Mach's ideal of ascribing gravitation and the laws of mechanics to the actual content of the universe. I should add that we cannot of course assess the motions of the contents of the universe by to-and-fro light-signals. Instead we observe red-shifts in spectra, and the investigation has to be completed by inferring certain of the laws of optics. The wheel of investigation comes full cycle: we end with the optical laws which will hold good amongst our observers' observations of the atomic absorption and emission processes at one another, and so verify that the constructed kinematic entity is realized in nature.

It is of course impossible to convey in this article any of the details of the foregoing investigation.[1] Nor is it possible to explain the distinction between the τ-scale of mechanical laws and a closely allied regraduated t-scale in terms of which *optical* phenomena find their simplest description. In the t-mode of description, the universe appears as expanding and spectral red-shifts are understood as Doppler effects; in the τ-mode, the universe appears as non-expanding, and red-shifts are due to a secular acceleration of atomic frequency at the observer as compared with the atomic frequency which was emitted long ago by the distant atom. The time-measure τ of an event proves to be an invariant, the same for all fundamental observers, wherever situated, and so leads to an absolute Newtonian assessment of simultaneity by these observers, on the τ-scale.

This final result may comfort those, Dr. Cleugh amongst them, who have a hankering after "objective simultaneity." I can only hope that they are in a more enviable position than that of the mathematical physicist chronicled in the rhyme:

"A mathematician of piety
Was relativist to satiety,
But he mixed in his mind
Each different kind
Of meaning of simultan*iety*."

E. A. Milne.

The Realm of Truth. Book Third of "Realms of Being." By George Santayana. (London: Constable & Co., Ltd. 1937. Pp. xiv + 142. Price 10s.)

I must warn the readers of these few lines (if there should be any readers) honestly at the outset that what I am here setting down is not a *review* but a "grouse." My excuse for this proceeding is that, after more than one reading, I do not feel competent to review Professor Santayana's book, because, thanks

[1] In which the writer has been materially helped by Mr. G. J. Whitrow.

perhaps to my own imbecility, I do not understand it at all; but I do feel equal to a "grouse" which I think is justified. What I first want to complain of is exactly what I know will recommend these pages to some readers, the amount of "fine writing" they contain. I mean writing which, in its way, not merely seems fine, but is fine. There is a dainty preciosity about the author's diction, and a perpetual recurrence of picturesque metaphor, which remind one at some times of the style of Agathon's encomium of Eros in the *Symposium*, and at others of the nobly born English writer who expressly calls his most ambitious essay a *Rhapsody*.

Mr. Santayana's style is, indeed, better than that of either Shaftesbury or Agathon; it recalls Walter Pater and not Gorgias. But the trouble, to my mind, is that I do not believe philosophy can be written successfully in the manner of Pater, however excellent that manner may be for some other purposes. Urania, if it is she who presides over philosphers, is, in Plato's phrase, one of the "severer Muses." It is not for her to charm us by the ingenuity of an egg-dance among bewildering metaphors. As I was wrestling with Mr. Santayana's pages, I turned sometimes for refreshment after one of his chapters to St. Thomas Aquinas, and words will not describe the relief I got by doing so. The "ox" of the Dominican order cannot trip it like Mr. Santayana; his tread is neither "light" nor "fantastic," and the compiler of *morceaux choisis* could never be likely to include any extracts from him in an anthology of the beauties of European prose. And yet I think that a φιλόσοφος, at any rate, will feel that there is a beauty about a piece of exposition by him which is regularly misused by writers on philosophy who are preoccupied with the anxiety to produce *littérature*. I mean the austere beauty which comes from the single-minded desire to say what you believe to be true and why you believe it to be true as straightforwardly as a man may, without one thought of verbal graces and adornments. A writer with Mr. Santayana's native gift of expression could clearly do the same thing if he would, and do it beautifully. Why does he impair the effect of his own work by his incessant quest after picturesque metaphor? Why must I, as I try to read him, find myself over and again, like Hamlet, praying that he would "leave" his no doubt graceful "faces and begin"? What have I really learned about truth, for example, when I have read (p. ix) that it is "a furrow which matter must plough upon the face of essence"? Or what is really contributed to the understanding of the moral judgement when we are told (p. 73) that "the cry *How beautiful!* or *How good!* may be sincere, and it may be applauded, but it is never true? If sincere, such a cry is also never false."

I suppose that my distaste for the picturesque metaphors in which the author indulges himself so freely is, at bottom, largely due to a conviction that the metaphors are something more than metaphors; they are pieces of a myth, and a myth which impresses one as false. All through the chapters which deal with the different varieties of truths (commonly so-called) Professor Santayana, like the Socialist park-orator in *Punch*, is not so much "arguing" as "telling us." It is assumed that we know already from his earlier volumes that there is a "boundless realm" of essences, and that only some of these essences are "exemplified" in "existence," those of them, namely, which have been seized upon, apparently very much at haphazard, by "matter." That "matter" should have made just the selection which it has made has apparently to be taken as a merely inexplicable fact which lies outside the plot of the story the philosopher has to tell, much as Aristotle says the reasons why Iphigenia is a priestess among the Tauri, and why her brother comes to the spot are outside the plot of a "typical" *Iphigenia* (which is concerned

only with the brother's danger of dying by his sister's hand, the mutual recognition, and the escape). But what if to a reader like myself this whole presupposed story of the boundless realm of essences, and the random selection (if you can call it so) of some of them for "exemplification," appears just as fantastic as any of Blake's monotonous stories about Urizen, or Orc, or Albion? Then we may appreciate, as I hope I do, a great many of the writer's *obiter dicta*, or admire his fecundity in metaphor, but we shall come away disappointed to have learned nothing in principle about the "realm" of truth.

This is just the predicament in which, whether by my own fault or not, I find myself. For the whole notion of a "boundless realm" of essences about which I can apparently know what they are and what their relations with each other are, though they are and eternally will be without any "exemplication" in existence, seems to me the veriest fairy-tale. If there is such an infinity of essences without "exemplification," for the life of me I do not know whether it was by a voyage of exploration into that realm that Lewis Carroll discovered the Jubjub and the Bandersnatch, or not. How does one distinguish a poet's imaginative flight into the aether of eternal "unexemplified" essence from the merest ravings of delirium?

It is, I take it, not without sound reason that so many philosophers, and those not the least among that goodly band, have dwelt on the thoughts that the *essentia* of a thing is not *id quod est*, but *id quo res est*, that possibility presupposes actuality and the like. Is not an *entirely* "unexemplified" essence *ex vi termini* an essence of nothing at all, and is not that a contradiction in set terms? In words Mr. Santayama comes very close to admitting the point. "The truth," he says, is "the whole ideal system of qualities and relations which the world *has exemplified or will exemplify* [italics mine]." His "unexemplified essences" then do not belong to the sphere of truth. But he is still haunted by the notion that we can and do make valuable excursions beyond this sphere into the "boundless" world of pure essences. If so, on the assumption that these pure essences have a being prior to and independent of the accident that "matter" embodies them in examples, how, to repeat my question, does one distinguish between such fruitful exercise of the poetic or mythopoeic imagination and the babblings of the veriest lunacy? Or are all such excursions equally fruitful? If they are not, then, it seems to me, there is a primordial something (Mr. Santayana's eminent colleague, Dr. Whitehead, has named it the primordial "nature of God"), which eternally discriminates real possibilities from the really impossible, and this something is no pure essence, but a *res quae est*, a primary existent, and the supreme business of metaphysics is with this "necessarily existing being."

Naturally these remarks mean that in my own opinion the foundations of philosophy have been wrongly laid in the two volumes to which the present book is a sequel, and that by inevitable consequence the discussions of the present volume, however happy they may be and are in incidental observations, present us with a picture of the "realm of truth" which is out of focus. My dissatisfaction involves, of course, no disparagement of the author's high abilities, and as I cannot, in dealing with this volume, take issue with the real source of my disagreement, the doctrines of its precursors, my expression of dissatisfaction has, as I said, to wear the appearance of a "grouse."

A. E. Taylor.

Nature and Mind. Selected essays of FREDERICK J. E. WOODBRIDGE. (New York: Columbia University Press; London: Oxford University Press, Humphrey Milford, 1937. Pp. x + 509. Price 18s. 6d.)

This volume contains thirty-seven essays selected from the author's writings (a bibliography of which is appended) and presented to him by Amherst College on the occasion of his seventieth birthday. The "Confessions" (reprinted from *Contemporary American Philosophy*, 1930) is followed by nineteen essays under the heading, "Metaphysics and Logic," and these by twelve under the heading, "Consciousness and Cognition." A final section contains five "Addresses." The order of presentation in each section is chronological. But no one, it is to be hoped, would make the bad mistake of trying to read them as an orderly development of a system of doctrine. Their consistency lies in the consistency of temperament, and their development in that which is appropriate to the sense of philosophical values.

So many foolish things have been said concerning the relation between a man's philosophy and his temperament that the more circumspect are content to leave the topic alone. But if ever a serious study of the subject should be made, this volume will afford an invaluable source of suggestions. In one of the most delightful of the essays, the author writes as follows on the doctrine of Creation: "There is about it a simple yet subtle beauty, which the imaginative are quick to appreciate and which even the dull may feel with a vague sense of mystery too high for them. Its aesthetic quality is so high that a connoisseur in doctrines might wish to keep it a precious possession, even when he did not embrace it as his faith." These essays are the writings of just such a connoisseur, and of one whose intellect and temperament so harmoniously co-operate that he suffers no conflict in his soul when he appreciates a doctrine without accepting it as true. Here, then, is a refutation, if refutation be needed, of the naïve psychologizing which would have us believe that the effect of temperament upon philosophy lies in the predetermination of irrational beliefs. It is, on the contrary, precisely our author's temperament which leads him almost passionately to declare what his reason coolly apprehends: "We cannot suppose, and there is no reason to suppose, that by the constitution of the mind we are obliged to think of things differently from the manner in which they are."

One of the chief functions of temperament in philosophy, perhaps, is to predetermine selection and synthesis in a field of apparently disconnected truths. It is difficult to believe that rational factors alone have been responsible for this author's synthetic, rather than eclectic, allegiance to Locke, Spinoza, and Aristotle, which is placed on record in the introductory "Confessions." To the influence of Locke he attributes his conviction that "we must go to our senses, not our souls, if ever we are to enter the realm of mind." But if Locke may serve to fortify a temperamental realism, Locke no less may lead us to Spinoza. "The principle of realism, carried out, seems to me to lead repeatedly to at least the implication of structure. . . . And that is why I have joined Spinoza to Locke in my affection. Few philosophers have had the sense of order as supremely as Spinoza had it." In the preoccupation with order and structure many of the essays in this volume find their inspiration. From Aristotle Woodbridge claims to have learned, among other things, to appreciate the philosophical importance of language, and to have derived his convictions that truth "is not a matter of things but of proposition" and that "knowledge is a matter of *saying* what things are."

One might be tempted here to trace temperamental affinitives between these essays and the doctrines of contemporary exponents of linguistic

philosophy; but of course there are differences. In moods of irritation we may be inclined to accuse some linguistic philosophers of a rather puritanical belief that there can be only one criterion by which a way of saying things may properly be judged. But in these essays liberal concessions are made to the principle that the manner in which things are said must be determined not only by technical considerations but also by reference to the all-too-human needs of communication. It is hard to believe that something has been rightly said when no one comprehends what is meant. We live in a strange world, and it may be necessary at times to talk philosophical nonsense in order to be understood. So often philosophical slogans help us not so much to see what their authors mean than to sense the direction in which they have set their course.

A not too remotely connected point concerning the way that things are said arises in the essay on "Experience and Dialectic." The question is posed: "Why should we comment on great philosophers, and tell the world what they have thought, when they have already told the world themselves?" It would be much too simple to suggest that we merely elucidate. The truth, in part, is that through philosophical commentaries doctrine may undergo a sort of temperamental differentiation in expression; but Woodbridge develops this idea in an epistemological rather than in a purely psychological way. His answer amusingly suggests that the original philosophical exposition is a kind of *ding an sich* which can only be apprehended through the "phenomena" of the commentators' views. This is a little perturbing. One begins to wonder how the history of philosophy would fare if the principles of a thoroughgoing phenomenalism were applied to this particular case.

Perhaps the most significant of temperamental symptoms are to be seen in an attitude to philosophical "problems." Our author writes: "I have never been interested in the 'problems' of philosophy. . . . I cannot remember ever having been seriously worried about them. . . . The cry for a just God in a naughty world I have heard. But it all seems to me, speaking quite frankly, unfortunate and absurd, and sometimes abominable."

This surely is a variant of an attitude which pervades all the more radical, positivistic, empirical, realistic, and naturalistic schools. Such attitudes range from simple "healthy mindedness" to those that are apt to be characterized as downright flippancy or worse. They include that peculiar ambivalent tendency which finds expression in those who seem anxious to proclaim that philosophy is tremendously important but that its importance lies in the ruthless exposure of the nonsense that all philosophers talk.

In the divergent attitudes to "problems" something much more than matters of opinion are at stake. Those who utter the cry for a just God in a naughty world may be pained by the denial that such a God exists, but they suffer a more fundamental outrage when they are told that the question of His existence is not significant. Even an atheist may be shocked by the irreverence of the suggestion that to deny as to affirm that He exists is literally meaningless.

But no one will be shocked by any of these essays. Empiricist, positivist, realist—all these labels may apply, but the author is above all a connoisseur of doctrines whose sympathies and whose sensibilities are sufficiently catholic to find in almost any view that has been cherished something worthy of possession even though it cannot be embraced as a faith.

There are all too few philosophical essays that can be read for the pure pleasure of reading them as well as for intellectual profit, and in any anthology of such some of those here printed would certainly find a place.

C. A. Mace.

The Concept of Morals. By W. T. Stace, Professor of Philosophy in Princeton University. (London: Macmillan & Co. 1937. Pp. x + 307. Price 8s. 6d. net.)

This admirably written book is an attempt to restate utilitarianism in a form which will be free from the defects with which it was still encumbered in John Stuart Mill. If the thing can be done Professor Stace is the man to do it, and there will be many who, like myself, after reading his book will close it with the words: "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Utilitarian." Leaving for a moment the "almost" and taking first the negative side of the argument, it is a criticism of the two extreme views which he calls respectively Ethical Relativism and Ethical Absolutism. But it is the former which draws his main fire, and is chiefly dealt with in the first two chapters. While it is true that "morality lies in the region of the empirical, the variable, the doubtful, the human," yet there is sufficient normality in the outlines of human nature to give us a valid criterion of right and wrong conduct as that which makes for the "satisfaction" of its fundamental needs, *alias* Happiness. The author thus begins where Mill leaves off in the recognition of different kinds of needs and according different qualities of happiness, and in what he calls a "scale of values, the conception of higher and lower satisfactions." True, it is vain to attempt to arrange these in any precise order, but this does not prevent us from saying that there are some which like friendship, family affections, social intercourse, etc., with the expansion of personality that they bring, stand very near the top, and that disinterested altruistic feeling stands higher still, either at the head or sharing that position with "the exalted religious satisfaction of the mystic." As, however, this last is incapable of rational justification, it drops thenceforth out of view until it is recalled by "Jim" in the charming dialogue of the Epilogue, coupled with the accusation of the "naturalism" implied in the whole theory. What emerges as the main doctrine of the book is first that moral goodness in all its forms has no intrinsic value but ranks as a means to something else, namely happiness, and secondly that these forms (courage, temperance, justice, wisdom, and the rest) are, one and all, included in the virtue of altruism. In the working-out of this thesis in the ten remaining chapters of the book Professor Stace shows himself worthy of the great empirical English tradition which he follows. Nothing is here stale or hackneyed, but everything is fresh minted. Without trying to follow it in detail I will return to my "almost," and attempt to put as shortly as possible the reason why I feel myself still dissatisfied.

My difficulty centres in the vagueness and ambiguity of the two words on which the whole theory rests, namely "happiness" and "altruism." (1) Professor Stace has freed the former from one source of confusion in rejecting the view that it consists in the accumulation of pleasures. But when we have got rid of that confusion the question remains how alternatively it is to be defined. It is this to which what may be called the higher Eudaemonism has sought from the beginning to discover the answer, and so soon as the question is put in this form and a serious attempt is made to answer it (and none here have been more serious than Plato's and Aristotle's), it is found that it consists essentially in a form, organization, or *structure* of life which has to be actualized in the world of time, though in the end it must always remain more or less an ideal. If this is what the author means, I am all with him; but it will involve a change in his view of the virtues as *means*. They will thenceforth take their place not as means to happiness, but as constituents of it, and utilitarianism, as an appropriate name for the

theory, will disappear. (2) The attempt to reduce all virtue to altruism suffers from a like defect. That all morality is based on the power to transcend the narrow conception of that wherein selfhood consists, which is the mark of the selfish man, is by this time a commonplace of ethics. But to hold this is one thing, to proceed to obliterate the elements of structure in the life which is called good under the blanket-term of altruism is quite another. It is certainly true, as the writer says, that the ultimate rule of morals is that we should do our best in the situation that calls for action. But everything depends on the idea with which we approach the situation as to what constitutes the good life whether for ourselves or others, and the strength of devotion to it which Kant calls "the good will" and places above everything. It is because of the insufficient recognition of the place of this creative idea and the substitution for it of the vague conception of altruism that the utilitarianism here presented, with all its advance upon the old one, seems to me still to fail as the last word upon the subject. What is wanted as the foundation of a more adequate account of the "concept of morals" is a deeper analysis of the concept of value. If, as I believe, this carries with it the necessity of having recourse to something bordering on metaphysic, this ought not to frighten us when we remember William James's definition of metaphysics, as "only an unusually obstinate attempt to think clearly and consistently." We have only to add to this epigram as applied to our present subject that, in order to think clearly and consistently about morals, as about everything else, we have to think of it in relation to the Universe which has begotten it and with whose processes it must in some way be continuous. In this sense of the word our own age is essentially a metaphysical one. Even writers who, like Bergson, are as much out of sympathy as Professor Stace is with any form of ethical absolutism, have found the "closed morality" of social life inadequate to cover the facts or to make room for what the author himself acknowledges under the name of "the religious satisfaction of the mystic" as sharing with altruism the highest place in the scale of values. He is within his rights in passing all this over as to him veiled in a cloud of unknowing. But I think it a pity that he should do so. With the width of sympathy and clarity of vision he here shows himself to possess I am sure that his contribution to what is the chief desideratum of our time, a satisfactory metaphysic of ethics, would be of the greatest value. How far this would involve a revision of the scheme of this book is another matter. I believe that much that is of value in it would remain. It would only require to be set in a wider context.

J. H. Muirhead.

Christian Morals. By the Very Reverend M. C. D'Arcy, S.J., Master of Campion Hall, Oxford. (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1937. Pp. xi + 196. Price 5s.)

If "morals" means the truth about our duties, and the whole truth, there can only be one, not yet completed; and all qualified morals, such as Greek or medieval morals are but errors or partial truths. Father D'Arcy seems to think there is one and only one Christian morals, and that it is either identical with the one true morals or the nearest approach to it yet achieved. But I am not sure whether he thinks that it differs from other morals in its fundamental conception of duty, or merely that Christians have different beliefs from other people about the situation in which that conception has to be applied. The first interpretation is favoured by his repeated condemnation of other morals as sentimental (i.e. not rational), as humanistic (i.e. merely

rational, not revealed?), as utilitarian (though he grants that Kant and most moderns are not utilitarian). But elsewhere he seems to base the superiority of Christian morals on a superior "knowledge," which he also calls "faith," of certain "proved facts" such as the reality of God and of human persons, the freedom of the will, which he does not further define, and human immortality. Some of these would be accepted by many philosophers who do not call themselves Christians, some would not, and some would not be accepted by all who do. Perhaps one who thought animals immortal might feel bound to treat them differently. But I cannot detect any changes in my beliefs about my duties to my neighbours when at different times I have thought them probably immortal and probably not; and I think the same might be true of all religious beliefs.

But Father D'Arcy holds certain views on social and political conduct which, though not all very widely held even by Christians, he thinks follow demonstrably from these Christian beliefs; though he sometimes seem to allow they would also follow from an enlightened consideration of the facts accessible to non-Christians. Among these views are: the absolute indissolubility of marriage; the unjustifiability in any circumstances of physical birth-control ("we can leave Nature to look after the question of population"); the iniquity of socialism (on the odd ground of the right of all men to property); the "disastrous consequences in housing, wages, and education"; of "the decline of the family"; the justifiability of some wars, and in particular of the Spanish rebellion. I think Father D'Arcy would attribute the views of those who differ from him on any of these points not merely to errors of fact, though these too he alleges (such as that they thought the Spanish Government was constitutional and likelier than any alternative to secure justice, liberty, and prosperity; or that they thought education, housing, and wages were improving), but rather to the "philosophical error" of generalizing our most obvious duties as those of justice and beneficence. I can see why he might call such a generalization humanist; I am not sure that he is entitled to deny that it is Christian. I cannot guess why he calls it sentimental.

But it is as hard to write, or to criticize, popular philosophy, as to go through the eye of a needle. When that philosophy is immediately applied to burning practical questions where all of us have, in no mercenary sense, vested interests, it is perhaps as hard for us as for camels.

E. F. Carritt.

Psychology Down the Ages. By C. Spearman, Ph.D., Hon. LL.D., F.R.S. Two vols. (London: Macmillan & Co. 1937. Pp. Vol. I, xi + 454; Vol. II, vi + 355. Price 30s. the 2 vols.)

This impressive work in two volumes by Professor Spearman is a most scholarly and accurate treatment of a very difficult theme—the establishing of an historical background to those doctrines in psychology which, in past times, have won common-sense approval, and which, in more recent times, have satisfied the rigorous tests of science. It is divided into five parts.

Part A—"What Psychology Is About" (four chapters)—traces the progress made since the time of Aristotle to formulate a science of mind. The record given of the rise and fall of doctrine is most interesting. Often scientific progress was made by "discovering" what had already long since been approved by common sense. The more the narrative proceeds, the more it becomes apparent that "the treacherousness of the quest for the simple has been evident throughout psychological history." Still the picture is not without its high-lights. For we learn that the fundamentals have been preserved, for

"apart from all such passing waves, the general tide of psychology seems to have arrived at conceiving the principle of mind, the 'psyche,' as an individual who feels, knows, and acts; . . . disconcertingly similar to what it was originally supposed to be by common sense." Great changes, which conferred lasting benefits on the science, have, nevertheless, taken place. "A great reduction has been effected by handing over its most baffling problems to philosophy, and by making a less reckless appeal for aid to physiology." In addition, the science has increased in maturity and stability by perfecting more precise methods of procedure. To those of introspection and analogy, of former times, have been added the more modern methods of induction, experiment, and mathematics.

In Part B—"What the Psyche Can Do" (seven chapters)—Professor Spearman gives a stirring account of the battles waged on the fields of "Mental Faculty." Both sides come forth from the fray with many scars but few trophies. Certain it is that there has been precious little glory in victory won over straw men. On one side we see the oft-repeated attempts to construct psychology "along the oligarchic pattern of faculties." Thus intellect, intelligence, attention, sense, memory, and the orectic powers have been set up, now and again, as unitary principles to explain human activity. The reasoning by which the several oligarchic doctrines have been reached is shown to be fallacious and devoid of foundation in fact. Nor have the rival doctrines availed much. "The faculties disappear, and we arrive seemingly at anarchic chaos." And all this because men have been seeking for the constituents of mind by inadequate means. "The knowledge required for science must show how the psyche is really constituted; it must be descriptive; and such a quest can only be rendered successful by fine enough analysis together with full enough synthesis."

This more accurate analysis of the psyche into its constituent structures is carried on in Part C—"How the Psyche is Constituted" (fourteen chapters). Among those listed are: "Perceptual Relations and Supplementations. In sensory perception two things are to be noted: "the one is the matter regarded, whereas the other is the way of regarding." This distinction between the objective and subjective side of cognition, Professor Spearman maintains, is of the utmost importance, for upon it depends a correct solution of such problems as: Mental Acts and Objects, Vicarious Images, Perceptual Meaning, Mental Quantity, and Perceptual Grouping. The revival of interest in orexis and the role of volition and conation are treated at great length. Other constituents of the psyche are: "Complexes of Behaviour" and "The Unconscious Mind," in both of which much of practical importance has recently been discovered. The problem of "I and Self," always of philosophic interest, is given a new setting in the light of recent empirical findings. The question of "Mental Unity" loses much of the importance formerly attached to it, and becomes nothing more in fact than the "subjective manner of presenting an object to mind." This introduces us to the "Confusion that is Gestalt Psychology" where after a thorough examination of the claim that the "whole" is prior in time to its constituents the conclusion is reached that "the doctrine would appear to have little foundation." Because of failure rightly to appreciate the part played by subjective "wholes," the Gestaltists are represented in the rather awkward position in which "having derived their results from subjective 'wholes,' they erroneously apply them to the objective kind." It is the reviewer's opinion that the Gestaltists conclude their analysis at the point where the work of Professor Spearman begins, and that much of the confusion resulting from the doctrine of "wholes" would be lessened had Professor Spearman shown more explicitly how objective "wholes" are precisely those

resulting from eduction, whereas the subjective are produced by processes not critically eductive.

Part D—"What Follows What" (seven chapters)—discusses the reign of law in the realm of mind. History shows "no good reason for the pessimism which would deny to the study of the psyche all possibility of being developed along the lines of genuinely scientific laws." Among the laws of mental sequence are some that have come down the ages, while many more are of recent origin. Due recognition is paid to the generous service rendered in every age by the classic law of association. Professor Spearman's scheme of mental laws is most imposing. In the first place we find the "Three Laws of Neogenesis" governing the quality of cognition. With characteristic modesty, he seeks to minimize the importance of this noteworthy contribution: "the real essence of the theory does not consist in discovering any brand new processes of knowing. The new aim has been, rather, to reduce all possible insightful processes to the operation of a small but complete set of them, which may be regarded as fundamental laws." There are, in addition, two general laws, "whose scientific status is more a promise than an accomplishment," and which govern orectic quality—laws of impulse and of will. The laws having sway over the quantity, both of cognition and orexis, are five in number: Output, Control, Retentivity, Fatigue, and Basal Conditions.

The study of Individual Differences is presented in detail in Part E —"What Goes With What" (six chapters). Interest in those qualities whereby men differ one from another is found in the psychology of every age. Embarrassed, however, by the vagaries of the faculty doctrine, this interest never developed scientific precision. It is only in most recent times that the subject has taken on a scientific character by reason of the extensive application of the method of correlation coefficients. And here we come upon the most fascinating chapter in *Psychology Down the Ages*—the determination of certain mental unities called "factors," derived by a statistical technique which will always be associated with the name and genius of Professor Spearman. This technique of "factors," first applied with success in the field of cognition, has more recently passed over into that of orexis. "The outstanding discovery recorded has been that, as the former sphere is dominated by the factor *G*, so is the latter one by *W*. With these two values known about an individual, a wonderfully long way has been travelled toward appraising his whole worth."

For philosophers this work has a distinct appeal. Here is a veritable storehouse of information on topics rich in philosophic implication. Moreover, the form and manner of treatment afford an object lesson in applied philosophy. Professor Spearman not only holds the view, but gives evidence thereof, that the mission of psychology cannot be carried on without close attachment to the categories of speculative thought, and that to eschew all metaphysical principles is to invite disaster. Professor Spearman has no uncertainty as to the course psychology should follow. *Psychology Down the Ages* indicates that it must follow the inexorable movement of history, i.e. it must stay wedded to common sense. Thus, as with all knowledge, psychology proceeds with great precision by definition and division.

F. Diehl.

The Problem of Art. By Canon Peter Green. (London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1937. Pp. xvi + 218. Price 6s.)

If I had been ordained I should take this book as my text for a sermon on what a professional man can do with his leisure; for Canon Green, in spite

of the multifarious and exhausting occupations of a pastor, has found time to add to his many writings on conduct and religion a theory of art whose qualities of clarity and freshness will recommend it to the plain man as well as to the scholar. Yet, had he enjoyed the free time of a research student, perhaps he would have read certain books that might have made him pause before committing himself to some of his views. I am thinking, of course, of the classics on art and the arts. There is, above all, the second part of Dessoir's *Aesthetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft*; there is Schmarow on painting, sculpture, and relief; there are G. L. Raymond's five volumes on the fine and applied arts; there is William Archer's *Play-Making*, on the art of drama; Herbert Read's *Industrial Art*, on the minor arts, etc.

Several of his major definitions look dangerously vulnerable. Aesthetics, according to the author, is "the philosophy of art," and its objects are to find an answer to the question, "what is art?" and to study the relations between art and other human activities. But, we may legitimately ask, what about other features of aesthetic experience such as the reaction of the spectator to works of art, the creative process that brings them into being, and the enjoyment of the scenery and seasons of nature? If these facts are just as relevant to aesthetics as a material work of art, his definition of the subject is too narrow and should be expanded to cover nature and the subjective side of aesthetic experience as well as art. Though he is apparently unacquainted with their writings, Canon Green has fallen into the same error as many of the "Kunstwissenschaft" school in Germany, which has endeavoured to adapt Hegel's view of aesthetics as a theory of art to the requirements of modern thought. He rightly argues that the philosophy of art cannot be confused with the philosophy of beauty, because art includes many objects and happenings that are pathetic, tragic, comic, or even ugly, without being in the least degree beautiful. But he goes on to define beauty as "the quality in a thing which arouses in us aesthetic emotion." This contradicts the earlier and correct view that all art is by no means beautiful, and challenges the beauty of a sunset or a carnation because nature, according to the writer, cannot produce aesthetic emotion. These difficulties would have been avoided if the beautiful had been recognized as a special brand of aesthetic experience, like the comic, the tragic, or the sublime, that cuts across art and nature without monopolizing either.

Most valuable and suggestive by far is the definition of art as "a conscious and purposeful human action directed to an end, that end being the expression of emotion for the sake of emotion." The result was obtained, he claims, by piecing together stray bits from Croce, Veron, and Tolstoy. The valuable elements of this definition are the stress on purposeful expression of emotion and on the transmission or communication of this emotion to an audience. Its weakness is that it rates form as at most a sort of minor concomitant of a work of art; whereas in fact no artist, however powerful his emotions, can dispense with a rigorous form, though sometimes—in the design of a carpet or an embroidery—he may jettison emotion for the sake of it.

With one small point I will conclude my review of this interesting little book. I hope the admirable criticism of Croce on page 44 will enjoy a *succès de scandal* in academic circles; the author should be read if only because he has seen through the meaningless rigmarole of the Neapolitan quack.

LISTOWEL.

Indian and Western Philosophy: A Study in Contrasts. By Betty Heimann, Ph.D. (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 1937. Pp. 156. Price 5s.)

Here are in eight chapters the printed product of a course of Forlong Fund lectures, given as a special course at the School of Oriental Studies, London, in 1936. Distributed under the usual philosophical heads, they conclude with a discussion on a convergence between Western and Eastern thought, which to the author is apparent, but apparent only. Her conclusion is, that "the divergent lines of East and West belong to wholly different planes, so that even if they sometimes appear to converge, still they will never meet."

Dr. Heimann's thought is brilliant and suggestive always. I might comment on what that thought has now given us, that once we take up the study of unlikeness, in bases or in evolution, we must, in order to be truthful, be much more discursive than it is possible to be in such brief sketches as these. Many are the points considered; many more will be those left aside. For instance, no inclusive lecture on Ethics (No. 4) can fitly omit notice of the mighty word "conscience," as worded in the East. More especially when ethics is here viewed, as viewed it must be, as the outcome of Immanence—of God (or as the Western gospels say "the kingdom of God") within you, as your very Self-in-the-More. We say, in this matter of unlikeness, a shepherd sees every sheep as different where we see all as looking alike. Yet, were we to discuss sheep-philosophy with him, we should be sure to hear much about the nature and the ways of "sheep," wherein is likeness rather than the reverse. Let us hope that the author will now consider, not the reverse but the likeness. We speak, we write philosophically to elicit what is true in man as we find him. And to do that we must not consider him merely as he is, for that is only what he seems to be. He is ever seeking a More, however wrongly he may now and then conceive his "More," and is thereby becoming More. And in him so seeking we may find a bond of likeness both in East and West, which is much more worth while discussing than the accidents of his many less basic or contingent unlikenesses.

India has been even more obviously a seeker from of old than we, and I cannot accept the author's dictum that "India has remained unchanged and uniform throughout all historic times," the belief in karma, rebirth, and liberation being cited as instances. We can trace the emergence of liberation from Vedas to an abstraction in Mid-Upanishads; we can note the up-coming of a theory of karma in those that are earliest; we can mark the quickening, the new sense of a near reality given to other lives than this span of one earth-life in the first Buddhists' expansion of the meaning of life as a dynamic becoming figured as wayfaring. Dr. Heimann has done justice to this ever-moving evolution in India's "Werden" in *maya* and other concepts. I appreciate her courageous attempt to present compressed an immense subject suggestively; I shall appreciate even more an attempt to vindicate a true human fellowship in man's fundamental quest in search of a More on his way to a Most.

C. A. F. Rhys Davids.

De Veritate. By Edward Lord Herbert of Cherbury. Translated with an Introduction by Meyrick H. Carré. (Bristol: J. W. Arrowsmith, Ltd., for the University of Bristol. 1937. Pp. 334. Price 12s. 6d. net.)

A translation of this famous treatise made from the last edition published in the author's lifetime was a piece of work well worth undertaking. Edward

Lord Herbert of Cherbury is a sufficiently important figure in the history of English thought to deserve that Englishmen interested in philosophy should study him at first hand and not remember him only as the object of certain criticisms in the first book of Locke's *Essay*, and as the alleged father of "deism." For he was in fact a serious thinker, who was in his own time respectfully read by Descartes and saluted by Gassendi as the countryman of Bacon to whom that great man had handed on the torch of philosophy; while if by "deism" be meant (as is often the case) the doctrine of a Creator with whom his creatures can hold no personal communion, and who, having made a world, left it to run by itself, no doctrine could be less like Herbert's. To such a first-hand study a good English version, especially if accompanied by notes indicating the sources of quotations and explaining allusions, would be of great assistance; for neither the original Latin nor the contemporary French translation which Descartes found less difficult is easy reading. Mr. Carré has not, indeed, added notes of this kind; but he has prefixed an introduction which is interesting and informative (though one cannot read without surprise the remark that in the *earlier* period of the sixteenth century a certain spirit had prevailed in English theology "under the influence of such men as Colet, Tyndale, and *Hooker*"—who died, under fifty years of age, in the *last* year of the century in question!). The translation itself is, however, unfortunately less useful than it would have been had the translator not been too often, in passages where his help would have been most welcome, content to supply a rendering which neither makes sense in English nor accurately represents the Latin. It would have been far better on such occasions had he frankly indicated an often very excusable failure on his own part to grasp his author's meaning. Two or three instances of this fault in judgment may be given in justification of what has been said; the references given will be first to the pages of the 1645 edition, then to those of Mr. Carré's translation. *Animam nostram*, writes Herbert (pp. 71, 151), *non solum ad imaginem Divinam conditam et ejus quidem Ectypum fuisse, sed partem etiam aliquam sapientiae Divinae universalis in Notitiis Communibus impertitam fuisse, existimamus.* "I conceive," Mr. Carré translates, "that our mind is not only created in the image of God or in the copy of that image, but it has, in the Common Notions, some share in the Divine Universal Providence." Fidelity to the text should have forbidden here "or" for *et* (though if, as is possible, "in the copy" is a misprint for "is the copy," this would no doubt be immaterial) and "Providence" for *sapientiae*; and it will be obvious to a careful reader that this indifference to accuracy in detail has resulted in two real, if only slight, misrepresentations of Herbert's meaning. More serious is the rendering (pp. 186, 267) of *cum difformitas realis nostra ex parte clavi possit, habemus etiam unde cruciemur in aeternum, cum sine resipiscentia vera iisdem semper haeserimus vestigiis* as "But there are also possibilities of endless torture, since real disharmony can arise from our side, and we should always follow the same path were it not for true penitence." Herbert's point here is that, whenever we continue in the same sinful course of conduct without true repentance, a real lack of conformity to the divine First Cause (in whose image we are created) may arise, which may result for us in the suffering of eternal torment. The passage is perfectly intelligible in its context, but what the translator offers as its rendering, if it makes any sense at all, suggests the direct opposite of what the author intends. Again (pp. 192, 273), Herbert, speaking of time and motion, observes that time cannot be explained by motion, because neither *eternity* at one extreme, nor *the instant* at the other (both of which, in his view, fall under the head of time) can be thus explained. *Licet interea tempus et motus inter se conformari possint, omnisso per se distinguuntur;*

quod ex eo patet, quod non solum instans sed ipsam (we should, I take it, read *ipsa*) *etiam aeternitas illa quam nullus mortalium Primo Enti non tribuit, ex motu describi nequeat; uti enim non pertingit aeternitatem Motus, ita quidem in illo praeterit Instans.* Here Mr. Carré has actually reversed Herbert's statement. "Though time and movement," he says, "can be compared they are quite distinct. This is clear from the fact that not only an instant but eternity, which no one denies of the First Being, can be explained by movement. No movement is prolonged into eternity, and an instant is swallowed up in movement." One might have conjectured that "can" is here merely a misprint for "cannot," but if we read "cannot," the sentence becomes awkward to the point of unintelligibility. Had the translator understood his author he could easily have written "neither an instant nor eternity . . . can be explained by movement."

Once more. On pp. 224, 305, we read: "If we abandon these principles . . . and if we give way to wicked blasphemies, terrible crimes, and finally to impenitence, to which we are sacramentally bound." If any reader, unable to attach any meaning to the last clause, refers to the Latin, he will find the following: *Hisce interea si exciderimus . . . et blasphemiis impiis, sceleribus horrendis, et denique impoenitentia nosmetipsos sacramento quo tenemur, exolverimus.* That is: "If we have abandoned these principles . . . and, by wicked blasphemies, horrible crimes, and in the end by impenitence for these sins have released ourselves from (i.e. have behaved as though we were released from) the oath of allegiance (i.e. to our Creator whereby (as His creatures) we are bound" (the words in brackets I have added to elucidate the meaning, but without them the version I have given does, I venture to think, make sense).

These examples will make it abundantly clear that Mr. Carré's translation is not always to be trusted. In the present case—where the object of the translator is presumably rather to assist the student of a work whose historical interest is greater than its intrinsic importance, whether philosophical or literary, than to make a classic "speak English"—it would probably have been better, as a rule, to err in the direction of over-literalness than of over-freedom; but such renderings as "romances" for *historiae admirandae* (pp. 96, 176), "detection of truth" for *veritatum notitia et delectus* (pp. 12, 88) certainly fail, in different ways, to reproduce with precision the sense of the original, without in any way improving the readableness of the translation.

The treatise *De Veritate* itself is a work on which its author set great store. Its publication, decided upon by Herbert after consultation with Grotius and Tillenius, and in obedience to a sign from heaven, was in his view a momentous, even a revolutionary event in the history of philosophy. The greater part of it is occupied by what we should now call an epistemological discussion, designed to establish the necessity to all knowledge of *Notitiae Communes*, present in the mind prior to individual experience; a discussion which, as Mr. Carré points out, anticipates the Common Sense doctrine of Reid, and which entitles Herbert (who was Hobbes's senior by five years) to be regarded as the first of that long succession, extending from him, through the Cambridge Platonists, to the idealists of the second half of the nineteenth century, of English critics of the empiricism which, although generally regarded abroad as characteristic of our national way of thinking, in fact constitutes only one side of our contribution to philosophical speculation. This portion of Herbert's book culminates in the sections devoted to the exposition of a new list of categories (called *Zetetica*) for which extravagant claims are made by its inventor as being wholly original, but which, according to Mr. Carré, is "taken over with little modification from the tables of Lullus

and Ramus," and certainly resembles these too nearly to deserve to be so regarded.

The chapters on the Common Notions concerned with Religion and Revelation, which follow and intervene between those relating to the *Zetetica* and three concluding sections, dealing respectively with Probability, Possibility, and Falsity, have attracted more attention than any other part of the treatise; and Mr. Carré is right in regarding Herbert's theology as having a claim to be considered epoch-making which cannot be conceded to his theory of knowledge. That theology is, as has been already observed, very far from what is generally understood by "deism." It is a positive doctrine of divine revelation, which is still well worthy of sympathetic study, even by those to whom a knowledge of the religious development of humanity in the past is available far more extensive than anyone possessed when Herbert wrote. Herbert was, indeed, himself a pioneer—as the writer of his book *De Religione Gentilium*—in the comparative study of religions which has, since his day, so remarkably affected the outlook of those who are interested in the philosophy of religion.

If Mr. Carré would devote himself to utilizing the fruits of the study which he has already bestowed on Herbert's chief work in the preparation of an edition of it, constructed with a more concentrated endeavour to wrestle with the difficulties of the author's exposition than is evident in the translation now before us, and enriched by a thorough investigation of its historical background and antecedents, he would be conferring on his fellow-scholars a very real and considerable benefit.

CLEMENT C. J. WEBB.

Art and Truth. By J. W. R. PURSER. (Glasgow: Jackson, Son & Co. 1937. Pp. vii + 239. Price 7s. 6d.)

In the space appropriate to a reviewer it is hard for him to give due weight to the merits, however considerable, of a work whose general method and assumptions he condemns. He is bound to be dogmatic, which may be one of the faults he is finding.

Mr. Purser himself seems to distinguish two methods, a "philosophical" (or Socratic) in which we discover, and test, by instances, say, of beauty or morality, the universal principle exemplified in them, and another which he calls "logical." In the first of these, if I understand the distinction, he is eminently successful. On the relation of art to scientific, historical, moral, and philosophical truth, on the importance of subject, and similar topics, perhaps no better guide could be offered to the unphilosophical art critic who wants to co-ordinate and understand his intuitive judgments. And it is a good guide, not only because the conclusions are usually acceptable even when they are original, but because opposite views are sympathetically stated and given their full weight. But the "logical" element in the book must be to such an uncritical reader extremely misleading, and to one of philosophical training appalling in its dogmatism and looseness of language.

It seemed a good idea, in such a book, to escape all questions of interpretation by avoiding any names of philosophers until the last chapter. But the price paid is hieratic assurance. "*Modern aesthetics*[1] do not explain . . . the difference between 'expressing' one's feelings and uttering them" is hardly fair to Croce. "That we can ever know anything about . . . things as they exist in themselves has long ago been exploded in *philosophy*" is hardly fair

[1] My italics throughout.

to any philosophers except Hume (once casually mentioned), not even to Kant and Hegel, the only two mentioned with approval, or to the author himself. The queerness of this last quotation is partly explained when we discover that by "things as they exist in themselves" is meant not, as usual, things as they really are but things not related to other things. The general argument seems to be that relations are created (not apprehended) by thinking and that since nothing but the whole can be unrelated, all things must be created by thinking. To "*bring a thing into* relation with another" is "to identify the two to a certain extent." So the law of contradiction is self-contradictory, and only the whole or unrelated is real, and that is thinking, about which, then, we should apparently know nothing. Yet apparently we do know that it creates or has created "things," with which it then stands in relations. In Mr. Purser's words, "Stars and stones . . . in their existence have to be continually maintained by thought (the universal thought), and thought does itself an injustice by descending to this office, for in fact their existence is a false kind of existence." Here arises a serious ambiguity in the use of the phrase "the mind," which sometimes means the minds of men (e.g. "they appear to *the* mind to be so") and sometimes something else (e.g. "an objectivity independent of individual minds is the fundamental characteristic which *the* mind gives to material things").

It is a confusing characteristic of such philosophical style that common words are used with an uncommon meaning but still also in their ordinary sense. This occurs with the word "form" which is sometimes opposed as "symbol" to "content" or meaning, sometimes as whole or unity to elements or parts; with the word "universal" sometimes opposed to individual, sometimes identified with it, sometimes identified with wholeness, sometimes opposed to physical; with the word "morality" sometimes meaning right conduct, sometimes good conduct, and sometimes conduct. Perhaps the fairest way of exemplifying the criticism I am making would be the selection of some usages of the word "truth," which seems sometimes to mean what the word generally does mean, but at others reality, knowledge (i.e. certainty), goodness, wholeness, infinity, universality, individuality. From such a selection readers must judge whether they can understand and accept these usages:—

Philosophical truth consists not in the agreement of our thought with reality but in the agreement of reality with our thought or *ideals*. It is reality which is true. *The* mind is the one truth (pp. 19–20).

Beauty is philosophically true, so far as in it brute fact has taken upon itself the *values* of mind (p. 23).

Imagination is a species of knowing (p. 40).

The calmness, serenity, permanence, and profundity of truth (p. 75).

Everything that exists aims at being the one absolute fact, it is nearer to the truth in proportion to its success. If truth was a fact among other facts, those other facts would give the lie to it by existing outside it (p. 107).

Art is truer than morality because it does not distinguish the subject from the object (pp. 118, 123), and truer than science because it does not distinguish appearance from reality, but accepts nature at its face value (p. 122).

Intemperance and cowardice are moral falsehoods (p. 160).

Truth is *a* whole and *an* all, not the sum of existent things (*half*-falsehoods exist) but in the sense that there is no truth outside it. What is outside truth is nothing (pp. 184–5).

To know nature in its truth we must preserve only the best side of things (p. 192).

The world of sense is both the adequate embodiment of truth, and yet, considered in itself without reference to *the* truth, an utter falsehood (p. 194).

Sensuous appearance is a falsehood, but science *makes it into a* truth by opposing *its* laws to it as a *superior truth.*

Truth as it existed before created things assumed their present shape, and as it exists now in all created things, cannot contain sensation in it as an actuality or even as a mental vision, but only as a thought (p. 214).

The existence of partial categories as fact will be an existence of falsehood. They have no real right to exist as facts (p. 228).

The truth of falsehood is simply universal being (p. 229).

With such a view or views of truth, the "truth of art" will naturally be protean. "It is *obvious* that beauty exists *only* in *the* mind," it does not "exist as a fact when *nobody* is looking at it," yet it is "independent of *individual* minds"; and art may be "beautiful, though we personally do not find it so, because *the artist's* mind has objectified itself" in it.

Those who regard such language at all as I do may wonder how it can be related to the sensible and acute discriminations which I mentioned earlier. I have wondered myself why the aesthetics of such schools of idealism (Hegel himself, Croce for instance, and Bosanquet) are so much more fruitful, or, to speak rudely, so much less patently inept than their ethics. May the answer be that the "mind-dependency" or subjectivity which idealism attributes to all things, and which seems so obviously inapplicable to obligation, is in fact the nature of beauty? E. F. CARRITT.

Books received also:

H. J. PATON. *Fashion and Philosophy.* (Inaugural Lecture, 1937.) Oxford at the Clarendon Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1937. Pp. 23. 2s.

N. V. SIDGWICK. *The Organic Chemistry of Nitrogen.* (New edition revised and rewritten by T. W. J. TAYLOR and W. BAKER.) Oxford at the Clarendon Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1937. Pp. xix+590. 25s.

VARIOUS AUTHORS. (Edited by J. B. TREND and H. M. J. LOEWE.) *Isaac Abravanel.* Cambridge at the University Press. 1937. Pp. xxvii + 157. 7s. 6d.

VARIOUS AUTHORS. *The Problem of the Individual.* (California Publications in Philosophy, Vol. 20.) Berkeley; University of California Press; London: Cambridge University Press. 1937. Pp. 206. 9s.

S. KIERKEGAARD. (Tr. by A. S. ALDWORTH and W. S. FERRIE.) *Purify Your Hearts! A "Discourse for a Special Occasion . . ." published in 1847 at Copenhagen.* London: C. W. Daniel Co. 1937. Pp. 179. 7s. 6d.

E. GUTKIND. (Tr. by M. GABAIN.) *The Absolute Collective. A Philosophical Attempt to Overcome our Broken State.* London: C. W. Daniel Co. 1937. Pp. 119. 6s.

F. S. MARVIN. *The New Vision of Man.* London: G. Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 1938. Pp. 171. 5s.

E. JORDAN. *The Aesthetic Object: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Value.* Bloomington, Indiana: The Principia Press. London: Williams & Norgate, Ltd. 1938. Pp. xii + 275. 15s.

M. HARRINGTON. *A Biological Approach to the Problem of Abnormal Behaviour.* Lancaster, U.S.A.: Science Press Printing Co. 1938. Pp. 459.

T. J. LAWRENCE. *A Handbook of Public International Law.* (Eleventh edition, by P. H. WINFIELD.) London: Macmillan & Co. 1938. Pp. xvi + 207. 3s. 6d.

A. LICHTIGFELD. *Twenty Centuries of Jewish Thought.* London: E. O. Beck, Ltd. 1938. Pp. 168. 2s. 6d.

MRS. RHYS DAVIDS. *To Become or Not To Become (That is the Question!): Episodes in the History of an Indian Word.* London: Luzac & Co. 1937. Pp. xi + 164. 1s. 9d.

N. MITCHISON. *The Moral Basis of Politics.* London: Constable & Co. 1938. Pp. xxi + 376. 8s. 6d.

M. M. SHARIF. *A Critique of Economics.* Simla: Fine Art Printers. 1937. Pp. 39. 12 annas.

G. DAWES HICKS. *Critical Realism: Studies in the Philosophy of Mind and Nature.* London: Macmillan & Co. 1938. Pp. xxiv + 346. 15s.

G. HORT. *"Piers Plowman" and Contemporary Religious Thought.* London: S.P.C.K.; New York: Macmillan Co. 1938. Pp. 170. 8s. 6d.

P. A. SOROKIN. *Social and Cultural Dynamics.* Vol. I: *Fluctuation of Forms of Art,* pp. xxi + 745, 21s. Vol. II: *Fluctuation of Systems of Truth, Ethics, and Law,* pp. xvii + 727, 21s. Vol. III: *Fluctuation of Social Relationships, War, and Revolutions,* pp. xviii + 636, 21s. London: G. Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1938.

E. STEINILBER-OBERLIN, with the collaboration of K. MATSUO. (Tr. by M. LOGÉ.) *The Buddhist Sects of Japan: Their History, Philosophical Doctrines and Sanctuaries.* London: G. Allen & Unwin, Ltd. 1938 Pp. 303. 10s. 6d.

H. LEVY. *A Philosophy for a Modern Man.* London: V. Gollancz, Ltd. 1938. Pp. 287. 7s. 6d.

J. L. STOCKS. (Foreword by the ARCHBISHOP OF YORK.) *Time, Cause and Eternity.* (The Forwood Lectures at Liverpool, 1935.) London: Macmillan & Co. 1938. Pp. xii + 163. 6s.

VARIOUS. *Knowledge and Foreknowledge.* (Aristotelian Society Supplementary Vol. XVI.) London: Harrison & Sons. 1937. Pp. 245. 15s.

VARIOUS. *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society.* Vol. XXXVII. London: Harrison & Sons. 1937. Pp. 245. 25s.

J. SINHA. *Indian Realism.* London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. 1938. Pp. xvi + 287. 10s. 6d.

H. E. BARNES and H. BECKER. *Social Thought from Lore to Science.* Boston & London: D. C. Heath & Co. 1938. 2 vols. Vol. I: Pp. xxiv + 790 + lxxxiv, $5. Vol. II: Pp. viii + 385 + lxxvii, $4.50.

H. FRYE. *Plato.* (University Studies of the University of Nebraska.) Lincoln, Nebraska: Published by the University. 1938. Pp. vi + 113. $1.25.

L. LAVELLE. *La Dialetique de l'Éternel Présent: De l'Acte.* Paris: F. Aubier. 1937. Pp. 541. Fr. 75.

V. JANKÉLÉVITCH. *L'Alternative.* Paris: F. Alcan. 1938. Pp. 219. Fr. 30.

J. KERGOMARD, P. SALZI et F. GOBLOT. *Edmond Goblot* 1858–1935*: La Vie: L'Œuvre.* Paris: F. Alcan. 1937. Pp. vii + 211. Fr. 20.

E. LOLLI. (Tr. par D. DE VESME.) *La Conception Inductive de la Vie. Essai Philosophique.* Paris: F. Alcan. 1937. Pp. 125. Fr. 15.

J. J. VAN BIERVLIET. *La Part de l'Imagination. Essai Philosophique.* Paris: F. Alcan. 1937. Pp. vi + 203. Fr. 30.

L. ACCAMBRAY. (Préface de J. NICOLÉTIS.) *Un Testament Philosophique. Prolégomènes à une métaphysique rationalle.* Paris: F. Alcan. 1937. Pp. 173, Fr. 30.

E. RAVIER. *Bibliographie des Œuvres de Leibniz.* Paris: F. Alcan. 1937. Pp. v + 703. Fr. 85.

VARIÉS. *La Notion de Progrès devant la Science Actuelle.* (Fondation "Pour la Science.") Paris: F. Alcan. 1938. Pp. 189. Fr. 18.

P. SCHRECKER. *Leibniz: Ses Idées sur l'Organisation des Relations Internationales.* (Henriette Hertz Lecture, 1937.) London: Oxford University Press, Humphrey Milford. 1938. Pp. 39. 2s. 6d.

A. C. Léemann. *Les Fondements Scientifiques de l'Holisme.* (Reprint of Acta Biotheoretica, Vol. III, 1937.) Leiden: E. J. Brill. 1937. Pp. 13.

F. Maugé. *L'Esprit et le Réel perçu.* Paris: F. Alcan. 1937. Pp. 316. Fr. 30.

M. Blondel. *L'Action.* Tome II: *L'Action humaine et les conditions de son aboutissement.* Paris: F. Alcan. 1937. Pp. 557. Fr. 60.

Variés. *Deuxième Congrès International d'Esthétique et de Science de l'Art.* Paris, 1937. Tome I: *Esthétique Générale; Psychologie; Sociologie et Culture.* Pp. lxiii + 369. Tome II: *Histoire et Critique; Science de l'Art et Techniques; L'Art Contemporain.* Pp. 527. Paris: F. Alcan. 1937. Fr. 120 les deux tomes ensemble.

G. Matisse. *Le Primat du Phénomène dans la Connaissance.* (La Philosophie de la Nature.) Paris: F. Alcan. 1938. Pp. 280. Fr. 40.

P.-M. Schuhl. *Machinisme et Philosophie.* Paris: F. Alcan. 1938. Pp. 109. Fr. 12.

L. Chestov. (Traduit par B. de Schloezer.) *Athènes et Jérusalem. Un essai de philosophie religieuse.* Paris: J. Vrin. 1938. Pp. xxxvi + 468.

G. Bachelard. *La Formation de l'Esprit Scientifique. Contribution à une Psychanalyse de la connaissance objective.* Paris: J. Vrin. 1938. Pp. 257. Fr. 40.

R. Schaerer. *La Question Platonicienne. Étude sur les rapports de la pensée et de l'expression dans les "Dialogues."* Paris: J. Vrin; Neuchatel: Secrétariat de l'Université. 1938. Pp. 272. Fr. 60.

J. Roche. *Le Gouvernement de Soi, avec le Secours des Moralistes.* Paris: F. Alcan. 1938. Pp. 463. Fr. 60.

J. Wahl. *Etudes Kierkegaardiennes.* Paris: F. Aubier. 1938. Pp. 746. Fr. 100.

R. Honigswald. *Denker der italienischen Renaissance: Gestalten und Probleme.* Basel: Haus zum Falken. 1938. Pp. 248. Fr. 10 broschierte; Fr. 12 gebundene.

K. Dockhorn. *Die Staatsphilosophie des Englischen Idealismus, ihre Lehre und Wirkung.* Bochum-Langendreer: H. Poppinghaus O. H.-G. 1937. Pp. x + 227.

A. Littasch. *Katalyse und Determinismus. Ein Beitrag zur Philosophie der Chemie.* Berlin: J. Springer. 1938. Pp. ix + 203. Rm 9.60.

K. Jaspers. *Existenzphilosophie.* (Drei Vorlesungen gehalten am Freien Deutschen Hochstift in Frankfurt a.M., Sept. 1937.) Berlin: W. de Gruyter & Co. 1938. Pp. iv + 86. Rm. 3.60.

T. T. Segerstedt. *Moral Sense-skolan och dess inflytande på svensk filosofii.* Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup. 1937. Pp. 510. Kr. 12.

Various. *Descartes. Homenaje en el Tercer Centenario del "Discurso del Metodo."* Universidad de Buenos Aires. 1937. Tomo II, Pp. 340. Tomo III, pp 360.

Review "Order and Life," Vol. XIII. No. 49.
January, 1938.

ERRATA.

Page 93, para. 2, l. 6, *for* 'organisation' *read* 'organism.'
Page 94, para. 2, l. 8, *for* 'effect' *read* 'effects.'
Page 95, para. 2, l. 11, *for* 'way on' *read* 'wagon.'
Page 96, para. 2, l. 10, *for* 'amounted' *read* 'amounts.'
Page 97, para. 2, ll. 1, 2, *after* 'interest' *insert* 'of the' and *delete* these words in l. 2.
Page 98, l. 1, *delete* 'to speak of.'

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *Philosophy*

Dear Sir,

I have occupied so much space of your magazine recently that I wish to make my reply to Mr. Mossner's criticism of my article on Hume's *Dialogues* as brief as possible.

Terms like "ingenious," "unfortunate," "widely accepted" are in my opinion merely blunders in elementary logic. "Making the wicked pious" is, I think, something which Mr. Mossner does with considerable effect himself in his *Bishop Butler and the Age of Reason*. Questions about originality are no doubt a matter of opinion and interpretation. I pass over his own identification of Butler and Cleanthes with the remark that it makes Hume's request for help "to bolster up" the argument of Cleanthes somewhat strange and not exactly complimentary to Butler. The reference to a letter from Hume to Henry Home containing an admission to being an infidel is, so far as I can learn, erroneous and should be to a letter to Oswald of Dunnikier (No. 58 in Greig); the comment I make on the passage is that in view of Hume's experience on several occasions prior to this of being called deist, atheist, sceptic, the phrase "from the character of an infidel" does not necessarily imply an admission of being an infidel; and in a later letter to Blair (No. 188 in Greig) he objects to being called an infidel. Mr. Mossner's assertion that scepticism *did seize* Hume is, so far as I can make out, once more an interpretation of Hume's remarks and not *prima facie* original evidence.

The main objection raised by Mr. Mossner turns on the supposedly *unhistorical basis* of my argument. I refuse to allow the historical basis to be limited according to Mr. Mossner's requirements—to the Anglican Church or, as he seems to do, to what he calls the representative, sometimes most distinguished, Anglican theologians. Such limitations raise questions which I am not prepared to discuss here. I emphasize as an essential element of the historical basis the outcome of the controversy in the eighteenth century to which writers called Deists, concerned also with Natural Religion, contributed. As Mr. Mossner has dealt with this issue in his *Bishop Butler and the Age of Reason* which I have read with pleasure and profit, may I use it and give some quotations to illustrate his view of the historical situation? In doing so I am following a method adopted also by Mr. Mossner in dealing with my argument.

(*a*) Speaking of Pope (p. 72) he says "*The Universal Prayer* . . . is not distinctly a Christian prayer. It is rather a prayer of Natural Religion." Thus Mr. Mossner admits a distinction not merely between Christianity and Deism but between Christianity and Natural Religion. (*b*) He refers to "the rising heresy of Unitarianism and rationalism in general" (p. 62). The statement that rationalism is heretical is Mr. Mossner's. Deism which was rationalistic and was concerned with Natural Religion was recognized to be unorthodox and caused alarm at Oxford and in orthodox circles (p. 70). "Infallible reason proved in the event a Nessus shirt poisoning the theology that wore it" (p. 125). Rationalism is here admitted to have been dangerous to theology. (*c*) "So in repudiating the certainty guaranteed by an infallible and universal reason, the apologist arrived jointly at philosophical scepticism and theological faith" (p. 126). Philosophical scepticism therefore did not necessarily lead to the discarding of faith; and Mr. Mossner admits that there were persons who held this position. He quotes Law to the effect that "the infidelity which is now openly declared for pretends to support itself upon the sufficiency, excellency and absolute perfection of reason or Natural Religion" (p. 126). That Law is not representative of the Anglican Church is irrelevant to my argument. (*d*) "Orthodoxy, now driven to its last defences, clung desperately to probability and the external evidences" (p. 145). On the other hand, the apologists were driving the Deists into

open scepticism and in doing so "were doing the inevitable" (p. 151). "The fall of reason meant the fall of Natural Religion and this was true for both parties" (p. 151). "The court of reason was no longer held sovereign; its cases were remanded to the realm of faith or to the realm of fact" (p. 152). "Not that the apologists forfeited all claim to a Natural Religion, but in the course of time they discreetly and quietly let the subject sink into abeyance" (p. 151).

Thus rationalism in religion ended in a somewhat strange result, and according to Mr. Mossner the idea of a Natural Religion was gradually dropped. Why, I should like to ask him, was it dropped if my contention, objected to by him, is wrong? Also, does he maintain that the discarding of Natural Religion meant the rejection of religion? And does he contend that the basis of such religion had to be found wholly anew on the failure of rationalism and was not already existent while rationalism was being tried out? Had all this result come about by the middle of the century when Deism, according to Mr. Mossner, had run its course? If so, Hume's *Dialogues*, published in 1779, in no way contributed to this result. The conclusion I emphasize is that his cavil at my historical basis has no justification in view of his own evidence, and that reference to it tells neither against my interpretation nor for his own. I add that he does not seem to have studied my argument very closely, for the historical basis is not the foundation of my argument; the statement he quotes is not even a loose brick in the building, but at the worst only a bit of loose plaster sticking to the structure.

Yours sincerely,
B. M. LAING.

SHEFFIELD,
March 10, 1938.

(This correspondence is now closed.—ED.)

TO THE EDITOR OF *Philosophy*

SIR,

Professor Muirhead's article, "Where is Philosophy Going?" in the October issue of *Philosophy*, needs reiterating. This season those of us who attended the Institute Lectures at University Hall and University College have had a good dose of analytical philosophy, and I for one (a very common reader of philosophy, to use Professor Stebbing's phrase) have found it very unsatisfying.

If indeed philosophy is just an intellectual pastime on a level with chess or some parlour game with no relevance to the understanding and living of life, I am persuaded that the interest in it of the majority of common readers will evaporate. "Distress of mind is the great awakener of mind," writes Professor Macneile Dixon in his delightful Gifford Lectures, "The Human Situation." How true that is. It is intensified men and women who have endured some pain or grief or who have seen anew, freshly and imaginatively, the enigma of existence, who seek for a philosophy of life. And it is just here that the analysts wound by suggesting that such incentives to philosophy are both misleading and shameful.

There is in some men's minds an obstinate conviction that the business of philosophy is to make, not only science, but life intelligible. If philosophy holds off from this effort and spends itself in small analysis issuing in scepticism, men like myself will cease to look to it for help and guidance and try to live our lives without it. Those of us who have been knocked about by life find such philosophy both irrelevant and trivial.

Yours faithfully,
P. D. ELLIS.

35 SPITAL SQUARE,
LONDON, E.1.
February 1938.

THE BRITISH INSTITUTE OF PHILOSOPHY

(*Incorporated under the Companies Acts* 1908–1917 *as a Company not for Profit by limited by Guarantee.*)

President:
THE RT HON. VISCOUNT SAMUEL, G.C.B., G.B.E., M.A., HON.D.C.L.

Chairman of the Council:
J. H. MUIRHEAD, M.A., LL.D., F.B.A.

Deputy Chairman of the Council:
A. D. LINDSAY, C.B.E., M.A., LL.D.

Hon. Treasurer:
THE RT. HON. LORD TWEEDSMUIR, C.H., G.C.M.G., D.C.L.

Director of Studies:
SYDNEY E. HOOPER, M.A.

Hon. Secretary:
P. M. ROSSDALE, LL.M.

INSTITUTE NOTES

DURING the past term Mr. I. Gallie, M.A. (of Wadham College, Oxford), has delivered an interesting course of lectures on "The Nature of Mental Process."

The Addresses at the Evening Meetings have been as follows: "The Rational and Empirical Elements in Physics," by Professor Herbert Dingle; "Philosophy and the Common Reader," by Professor L. S. Stebbing; "The Philosophy of Mysticism," by the Very Rev. W. R. Inge, K.C.V.O., F.B.A.

WRIGHT MEMORIAL LECTURE.

The Wright Memorial Lecture will be delivered by Dr. W. G. S. Adams, Warden of All Souls College, Oxford, on Tuesday, June 28th, at 5.45 p.m., at University College, Gower Street, London, W.C.1. The title of the lecture is "The Philosophical Study of Politics."

OBJECTS OF THE INSTITUTE.

The British Institute of Philosophy exists to bring leading exponents of various branches of Philosophy into direct contact with the general public, with the purpose of satisfying a need felt by many men and women in every walk of life for greater clearness and comprehensiveness of vision in human affairs.

With this broad educational purpose in view, the Institute—

(1) Provides at suitable times in the day and evening courses of lectures by leading exponents in the more important subjects coming within the Scope of Philosophy. All branches of

Philosophy are represented—Ethics and Social Philosophy, the Philosophy of Law and of the Sciences, of the Fine Arts and of Religion, as well as Logic and Metaphysics and Psychology.

These lectures are free to members.

(2) Issues a quarterly philosophical journal (free to members).
(3) Proposes to form a philosophical Library.
(4) Gives guidance and assistance to individuals in their philosophical reading.
(5) Encourages research in Philosophy.
(6) There are Local Centres of the Institute at Bangor, Cardiff, Liverpool, Manchester, Newcastle and Durham, and Sheffield.

Further information and forms of application for membership may be had on application to the Director of Studies, at University Hall, 14 Gordon Square, London, W.C. 1.

[Suggested]

FORM OF BEQUEST

I bequeath to THE BRITISH INSTITUTE OF PHILOSOPHY the sum of ..... free of duty, to be applied to the purposes of that Institute, and I declare that the receipt of the Honorary Secretary or other proper officer for the time being of that Institute, shall be sufficient discharge for the same.

PHILOSOPHICAL BOOKS BY

GEORGE SANTAYANA

THE REALM OF TRUTH 10/- net

Times Literary Supplement: "The fourth component of Mr. Santayana's metaphysical tetralogy is now before us; and the coping stone has thus been formally placed on the majestic edifice of which *Scepticism and Animal Faith* was the substructure.

"It would be superfluous to extol the rich variety and controlled fire of Mr. Santayana's poetic prose. Apart perhaps from Bradley at certain moments, no one since Hume and Berkeley has married English philosophy to such stately measures; and the force and elegance of his style are equally evident when the argument is clear and suave and when it is (as it occasionally is) either sinuous or abrupt."

Hibbert Journal: "The present work is the third in the brilliant series of essays in which Mr. Santayana expounds his metaphysics. It follows upon the *Realm of Essence* and the *Realm of Matter*, and one finds in it again that beauty and terseness of writing which the former works contained and which, together with the philosophical acumen everywhere present, stamp Mr. Santayana as one of the few artist-philosophers of our day."

THE REALM OF ESSENCE THE REALM OF MATTER

SCEPTICISM AND ANIMAL FAITH
An Introduction to a System of Philosophy

SOLILOQUIES IN ENGLAND & LATER SOLILOQUIES
etc.

12/– net each

and Professor Santayana's remarkable novel

THE LAST PURITAN 8/6 net

10 ORANGE STREET **Constable** LONDON, W.C.2

Introduction to Symbolic Logic

by **SUSANNE K. LANGER.** "Her book is to be unhesitatingly recommended to those who are familiar with the older logic and who wish either to learn something of what the new logic is all about or to prepare themselves for a thorough study of the *Principia.*"—*New English Weekly*

12s. 6d. net

The Buddhist Sects of Japan

by **E. STEINILBER-OBERLIN.** "A knowledge of the way in which Buddhism has developed in Japan is of considerable assistance towards an understanding of Japanese mentality . . . the volume is . . . a mine of information not hitherto available."—*Aberdeen Press and Journal*

10s. 6d. net

GEORGE ALLEN AND UNWIN LTD

Read Dr. Har Dayal's forthcoming book on Constructive Humanism

Twelve Religions and Modern Life

2/6 *post free*

Ready in December

MODERN CULTURE INSTITUTE

34 CHURCHILL ROAD
EDGWARE, MIDDX

SCIENTIFIC BOOKS

Works in all branches of Science, English and Foreign, including PHILOSOPHY, supplied from stock, or obtained promptly to order. Catalogues of new books of all publishers post free on request.

H. K. LEWIS & Co. Ltd.

136, Gower Street *Tel.* EUSTON 4282. **London, W.C.1**

MACMILLAN

PSYCHOLOGY DOWN THE AGES

By

C. SPEARMAN

PH.D. (LEIPZIG), HON. LL.D. (WITTENBERG), F.R.S.

EMERITUS PROFESSOR OF PSYCHOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON. LATELY GROTE PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY OF MIND IN THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON. FOR. MEM. SOCIÉTÉ FRANÇAISE DE PSYCHOLOGIE. HON. MEM. KENTUCKY ACADEMY OF SCIENCE. HON. MEM. DEUTSCHE GESELLSCHAFT FÜR PSYCHOLOGIE. HON. MEM. BRIT. PSYCHO. SOC. HON. MEM. PSYCHOTECH. CLUB, PRAGUE

2 Volumes. With Diagrams. 30s. net

"*Psychology Down the Ages* is an eminently sane, judicious and scientifically balanced work, easy to read and understand, and (to borrow the words of a reviewer of a former work of Spearman and apply them to this) the 'most distinguished British contribution to experimental psychology that has been made in recent years.' Indeed, both in comprehensiveness and clarity, it excels *The Abilities of Man*."—Dr. F. AVELING (*Nature*).

"It is comprehensive in scope, straightforward in manner . . . and so clearly and easily written that, for all that it is a text book, the reading of it is never a task and often a pleasure. . . . Professor Spearman makes the study of psychology so clear and simple a matter, that it is only when one remembers other text books on the subject that one realises, by contrast, the nature of the achievement that the clarity of presentation, the simplicity of style, entail. The book is likely to become a standard work on the subject; it is a psychological classic."—C. E. M. JOAD (*New Statesman and Nation*).

"Professor Spearman has a gift for lucidly disentangling essentials from mere ingenuities, and gives a valuable and trustworthy judgment."—KENNETH RICHMOND (*Observer*).

"What might well have been a ponderous work of dull erudition turns out in these two substantial volumes to be a work of almost continuous charm, thanks to the genial artistry of Professor Spearman. . . . . Only a man of rare powers of judgment could have written this comprehensive, wise and wholesome book."—*Scotsman*.

MACMILLAN

THE SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW

Journal of the Institute of Sociology

EDITORIAL BOARD

A. M. Carr-Saunders, Alexander Farquharson, Morris Ginsberg

VOLUME XXX JANUARY, 1938 No. 1

CONTENTS

Japan's Demographic Expansion in the Light of Statistical Analysis — Grzegorz Frumkin

Leisure in the Totalitarian State — Andries Sternheim

The Independence of Culture from Race — Maximilian Beck

Some Ideas on Social and Psychological Research — Marie Jahoda

Bismarck's Social Policy and the Problem of State Socialism in Germany — Hans Rothfels

Annual Subscription: £1 1s. 0d. (post free).
Single Copies, 5s. 3d. (post free).

LE PLAY HOUSE PRESS, 35 GORDON SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.1

ART AND TRUTH

by J. W. R. PURSER

Lecturer in English Literature in the University of Glasgow

7s. 6d. net

This book should interest not only the philosopher but the art lover. The author holds that it approaches more nearly than history or science to the final truth, which is, however, rational and philosophical rather than imaginative.

JACKSON, SON & CO.

PUBLISHERS TO THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW

PHILOSOPHY

★

All applications for Advertising space should be addressed to

T. G. SCOTT & SON

LIMITED

63 LUDGATE HILL, LONDON, E.C. 4

★

Telephone: CITY 4211 (2 lines)

CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. THE CONCEPTS OF POLITICS: J. D. Mabbott, M.A., B.Litt.	259
II. RESPONSIBILITY, FREEDOM AND DETERMINISM: John Bourke, M.A., Ph.D.	276
III. WILL AND ACTION IN ETHICS (I): Professor J. L. Stocks	288
IV. THE ALLEGED FASCISM OF PLATO: H. B. Acton, M.A., D.Phil.	302
V. LAWS AND THEORIES: Norman Campbell, Sc.D., F.Inst.P.	313
VI. THE RELATIONS OF PHILOSOPHY: Professor Jared S. Moore	321
VII. PHILOSOPHICAL SURVEY: PHILOSOPHY IN GERMANY	338
VIII. NEW BOOKS	345
IX. CORRESPONDENCE	378
X. INSTITUTE NOTES	381

THE BRITISH INSTITUTE OF PHILOSOPHY

Appeal for New Members and Donations

The Council appeals to members to do all in their power to introduce new members in order to extend the benefits of the Institute and to increase its revenue.

The Institute has no endowments, and its work, which includes lecture courses and meetings for discussion in the various Centres, as well as the conduct of the Journal, cannot be carried on from revenue derived solely from subscriptions of £1 1s. per annum. The Council, therefore, appeals for donations, small or large, from sympathizers with the Institute's aims.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN
BY UNWIN BROTHERS LIMITED
LONDON AND WOKING